

U.S. Denies Responsibility For 'Tiger Cages' at Conson

By Robert G. Kaiser

Washington Post Foreign Service

SAIGON, July 7—An American spokesman said tonight that U.S. officials had been aware of "tiger cages" at the prison on Conson Island, and had "discussed this with Vietnamese officials." But the spokesman went to extraordinary length to disassociate the U.S. mission from the operation of the Vietnamese prison system.

In a press conference convened hastily at 11 p.m. Saigon time, Roy W. Johnson of the embassy information staff read a statement which said:

"The United States mission is aware of shortcomings in the corrections program here in Vietnam. Our advisory effort and assistance are designed to help the Vietnamese government to the extent possibly we can to improve their system as rapidly and completely as possible . . ."

"Of course," the statement concluded, "the control of this system rests with the Ministry of Interior of the Vietnamese government. Specifically, there is no (American) public safety adviser stationed at Conson."

Two U.S. congressmen who visited the prison at Conson last Thursday reported in Washington yesterday that conditions there were "shocking."

Reps. William R. Anderson (D-Tenn.) and Augustus F. Hawkins (D-Calif.) said men and women prisoners were kept in the windowless, crowded tiger cages for long periods of time. Some had lost the use of their legs, the congressmen said.

In response to a question, Johnson said here today, "I am denying (American) responsibility for tiger cages."

He added that Frank E. Walton, a former deputy police chief in Los Angeles who is the chief American public safety adviser here, and his staff have "urged strongly that a detailed investigation be made and any needed corrections be made" at Conson. Johnson said this recommendation was made before the current publicity.

Reached by telephone this afternoon, Walton said he had been instructed "to keep

my lip zippered," and declined to comment further. He accompanied Reps. Hawkins and Anderson on their visit to Conson.

The tropical island, which houses more than 9,000 civil

criminals and political prisoners, including suspected Vietcong, has a reputation as a sort of Vietnamese Devil's Island.

See EMBASSY, A12, Col. 3

EMBASSY, From A1

In a mimeographed fact sheet about the prison, Walton referred to its unsavory reputation, saying, "In the opinion of the corrections advisers with lengthy penology experience, 'Conson is not a Devil's Island but on the contrary is a correctional institution worthy of higher ratings than some prisons in the United States.'"

U.S. Contribution

The embassy's prepared statement said that during the last fiscal year, the United States contributed \$442,000 to the Vietnamese penal system, primarily for construction of new facilities.

Johnson said that there already had been improvements made at Conson, and "possibly by Asian standards the prisons aren't that bad."

"I think the entire situation on the island has improved," he said, "maybe not that particular area (the tiger cages) . . ."

"They tell me in many ways it (Conson Prison) is ahead of many advanced penal institutions," Johnson said. He said he thought "about 500 people" were imprisoned in the tiger cages.

The U.S. public safety advisers are part of the pacification program, directed by Ambassador William Colby. Johnson was asked if Colby was concerned about the situation at Conson.

"He's been concerned about it for the last several hours," Johnson replied with a smile.

Johnson had no comment when asked if revelations about Conson's tiger cages had any effect on previous U.S. protests to North Vietnam about the treatment of American prisoners of war. He said that there were no prisoners of war in the Conson prison, only political and criminal prisoners.

Luce's Report

Meanwhile, an American representative of the World

Council of Churches who speaks fluent Vietnamese released a report on his visit to the prison with Reps. Hawkins and Anderson.

The American, Don Luce, 35, was director of the International Voluntary Service organization in Vietnam for six years until 1967, when he resigned to protest the war and U.S. policy here. He has been investigating prisons in South Vietnam for several months, and tried unsuccessfully to get to Conson before the two congressmen took him along as an interpreter.

The new charges about conditions on Conson came at a time when prison conditions and torture by police have become a public issue in Saigon. The issue has been pressed by students, including demonstrators from Saigon University and a group of young people jailed several years ago who were recently released from Conson.

Torture and mistreatment of prisoners is "taken for granted" by most Vietnamese, one thoughtful editor observed tonight. Such mistreatment has been common at least since the days of French domination, Vietnamese say.

In recent weeks, both President Thieu and Premier Tran Thien Kiem have made statements interpreted by Vietnamese as admissions that Saigon police had tortured students who were arrested during demonstrations this spring. The government has promised to bring half a dozen policemen to trial on charges of torturing students.

Five Vietnamese students recently released from Conson testified last month before a committee of the Vietnamese House of Representatives.

Food in the tiger cage, they said, consisted of rice, often riddled with sand and pebbles, and a form of dried fish which "people in South Vietnam often buy . . . to use as compost for plants." To supple-

ment this diet, they added, they ate leaves, grass, fleas and beetles.

"For toilet paper," they said, "we had to use a small scrap of cloth ripped from a shirt or pants pocket, which we carefully washed out with urine so it could be used again and again."

These former political prisoners were all avowed opponents of the regime, and they expressed pride at their defiance of the authorities.

Luce, in his report, said prison officials attempted to hide the tiger cage section of the prison from the congressmen. But former inmates that Luce had interviewed had told him where the small door leading to the section was located.

After interviewing men in one section of tiger cages, the visitors moved to an adjacent building where they found female prisoners in similar conditions. Luce wrote this description of an exchange with one prisoner.

"How old are you," I asked one beautiful girl.

"Eighteen."

"Are you a student?"

"No, I am a laborer. I worked in a factory."

"Why were you arrested?"

"I was in a peace demonstration."

"Are you a Communist?"

"At this, the young girl laughed at what seemed to her an irrelevant question."

"No, I'm not a Communist. I am not concerned about politics. I am concerned about peace."

"Will you salute the flag?" The guard who was standing beside me demanded.

"No! no, I will not not salute your flag which represents all the things you have done to me," she answered defiantly.

"Then you are a Communist and should be killed," the guard retorted in equally bitter tones . . .

July 8, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 6501

	Population, mid-1969	Calculated population		Annual rate of growth as of 1969 (percent)			Population, mid-1969	Calculated population		Annual rate of growth as of 1969 (percent)
		1980	2000					1980	2000	
31. Romania.....	20	24	35	1.8	41. Kenya.....		11	15	27	3.0
32. Congo (Kinshasa).....	17	22	35	2.3	42. Ceylon.....		12	16	26	2.4
33. Peru.....	13	18	34	3.1	Rest of Asia.....		66	87	142	2.5
34. Afghanistan.....	17	21	33	2.3	Rest of Africa.....		128	165	260	2.3
35. Algeria.....	13	18	32	2.9	Rest of Latin America.....		68	90	151	2.6
36. Tanzania.....	13	18	31	2.9	Rest of Europe.....		117	126	145	.7
37. Taiwan.....	14	18	31	2.6	Canada.....		21	26	39	2.0
38. Yugoslavia.....	20	23	29	1.1	Oceania.....		19	23	35	1.8
39. Venezuela.....	10	15	28	3.3						
40. Malaysia.....	11	15	28	3.1	World.....		3,550	4,439	6,778	2.0

Note: Data supplied by Dr. Raymond Ewell, vice president for research, State University of New York at Buffalo.

DATA II.—TIME REQUIRED TO DOUBLE A POPULATION

Annual rate of population growth	Number of years to double population
4.0.....	17.3
3.5.....	20.1
3.0.....	23.1
2.5.....	27.6
2.0.....	34.6
1.5.....	46.2
1.0.....	69.3

Note: To maintain the same standard of living for its people a country must double its output of goods and services (GNP) in the same time period that population doubles. To improve standards of living, it must more than double its GNP in the same time period.

DATA III

Income of husband and education of woman	Average number of children ever born per woman 35 to 39 years old in 1960		Difference
	White	Negro and other races	
Total married women living with husband.....	2.7	3.3	0.6
Income of husband:			
None.....	2.9	3.5	.6
\$1 to \$1,999 or less.....	3.1	4.2	1.1
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	2.9	3.4	.5
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	2.8	3.1	.3
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	2.6	2.8	.2
\$5,000 to \$5,999.....	2.6	2.8	.2
\$7,000 to \$9,999.....	2.6	2.8	.2
\$10,000 to \$14,999.....	2.7	2.4	0
\$15,000 and over.....	2.7	2.7	0
Total women ever married.....	2.6	3.1	.5
Years of school completed:			
No school years completed.....	4.1	4.1	0
Elementary:			
1 to 4 years.....	3.8	4.0	.2
5 to 7 years.....	3.3	3.8	.5
8 years.....	2.9	3.3	.4
High school:			
1 to 3 years.....	2.7	3.1	.4
4 years.....	2.5	2.5	0
College:			
1 to 3 years.....	2.5	2.2	-.3
4 years.....	2.4	1.9	-.5
5 or more.....	2.1	1.5	-.6

Note: These data are from the 1960 census, because differences for corresponding groups from the January 1969 CPS are not statistically significant, even though they tend to show a pattern very similar to that for 1960. (See 1960 report 3A of vol. 2, Women by Number of Children Ever Born, table 37 on income of husband, and table 25 on education of woman.)

RECORD VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives has been much criticized in recent months by scholars, journalists, and Members of this body. A recent survey by pollster Louis Harris showed that 54 percent of the American people view Congress negatively, the lowest rating in the last 5 years. When a

majority of the American people feel dissatisfied or alienated from the Congress, then it is high time for this institution to act to remedy that condition. A positive step by this body would be passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, soon to be acted upon by the full House, and adoption by the House of H.R. 1074 or H.R. 1075, bills that would require keeping a public record of teller votes in the Committee of the Whole.

In my judgment the House as presently organized is, in some respects, archaic. Not only are we ill equipped to cope with modern-day problems, but the rules and procedures which guide our conduct are outdated and, even worse, some are undemocratic. I speak specifically of the lack of record votes in the Committee of the Whole. This practice serves both to debilitate the democratic process and to cause confusion, suspicion, and mistrust among our constituents.

The practice of nonrecord voting in the Committee of the Whole developed in England centuries ago to protect Members of Parliament from the King's wrath. But in 1832 Parliament reformed the system to provide for record votes. The American House of Representatives, however, has yet to reform itself in this regard and is decades behind our English counterparts. By contrast, in the other body of the Congress there is almost always a rollcall on any major measure.

The Committee of the Whole is simply another committee of the House, though much larger, with some Member other than the Speaker presiding. There are, however, significant differences between the Committee's procedures and that of the House, particularly: a quorum of 100 Members rather than 218; amendments defeated in the Committee may not, for all practical purposes, be voted upon again; and, finally, rollcall votes are not allowed in the Committee. The consequence of these rules is that a handful of men in the Committee can defeat an ABM, health, poverty, education, or some other amendment without anyone knowing, except in unsatisfactory ways, who voted for what policy. That old but important idea that Representatives should be held accountable for their actions is subverted by this practice of the House.

When the framers of the U.S. Constitution drafted that document they intended the House to be closest to the people. As the well-known historian Joseph Story pointed out, it was the

opinion of the framers that the House "should guard their, the peoples', opinions, make known their wants, redress their grievances, and introduce a prevailing popular influence throughout all the operations of the Government." The implementation of these responsibilities is hampered by the lack of record votes in the Committee of the Whole, a procedure that prevents our citizens from knowing all they have a right to know.

One of the duties of a legislator is to represent the interests of the people who elected him. In many cases, however, the represented are not sure where their Representative stands on a question of public policy. This confusion arises because the House is a complex institution with intricate parliamentary rules, numerous committees and subcommittees, and dispersed leadership. A legislator may, for whatever reason, feel obligated to vote one way in committee, another in the Committee of the Whole, or vote still a third way on a rollcall vote. Only rollcall votes on the floor of the House are a matter of public record. Requiring votes in the Committee of the Whole, would be a step toward further democratization of House procedures by making visible and public an aspect of the legislative process that citizens need and expect to know about.

Why is it important to our constituents that record votes be taken in the Committee of the Whole? The answer is simple. Every American citizen is affected by the decisions of Congress in areas such as housing, education, health, poverty, or tax policy. When issues so vital to the Nation are discussed and voted upon, every citizen should have the right to know who supported and who opposed what bills at every stage of the legislative process. This is denied them because current House rules prohibit record votes in the Committee of the Whole. Yet amendments may be adopted or rejected in this Committee that can change the character and direction of national policy. Should our constituents and colleagues not be privy to this vital information? This question can only be answered with a strong affirmative.

Secrecy has no place in a legislative body that serves the people. It is obvious that procedures do affect policies, and when a procedure can serve to thwart the public will or deny it the information it needs in order to make judgments about its elected Representatives, then it is time for a change. The positive change I advocate is the requirement of record votes in the Committee of the Whole. I would add, Mr. Speaker, that

there has always been a question in my mind as to the constitutionality of denying a record vote in the Committee of the Whole if one-fifth of the House is in favor of such a vote. The reason for this suspicion is obvious: the Constitution guarantees a yea-and-nay vote if one-fifth of the House desires it.

TRIBUTE TO BILL TILSON, OF MOBILE, ALA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in the lives of many persons who have unselfishly dedicated themselves to serving humanity when suddenly out of a clear sky they are accorded public recognition much to the surprise of no one but themselves. Such a man is Bill Tilson, of Mobile, Ala., who I am privileged to have living in my congressional district, and whose name has gained familiarity nationwide as the individual most responsible for helping avert what might have been a terrible toll in lives during Hurricane Camille last summer.

As head of Mobile's Weather Bureau office, Tilson, who has been with the Weather Bureau for 40 years, along with his capable staff, took the initiative in warning civil defense directors and other public safety officials during the early morning hours of August 17, 1969, of the pending force and danger of this killer storm. The mass exodus from the Alabama and Mississippi coastal areas brought on by Tilson's repeated warnings against Camille is credited with saving countless lives.

On Friday, July 10, Tilson and his staff will be duly honored for their outstanding service by being presented the Environmental Science Services Administration's new Unit Citation for Special Achievement at a special ESSA awards dinner in Silver Spring, Md. This high award is but one more tribute for the exemplary work performed by Bill Tilson and his staff during the Camille disaster. Beyond a doubt, this award symbolizes the highest ideals of humanitarian service to this country. It is well deserved by those who serve in the Mobile Weather Bureau.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in doing so renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The United States has the greatest accessibility to television broadcasting in the world. There are over 600 TV stations in the United States compared to 130 in the Soviet Union.

THE PROBLEM OF MISDEMEANOR COLLATERAL INVOLVED IN DEMONSTRATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BLANTON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, I released the results of a special survey conducted at my request by Mayor Walter Washington's office concerning the problem of misdemeanor collateral involved in demonstrations here in Washington, D.C.—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 26, 1970, pages E5965 to E5967.

One of the most important aspects of that survey was the fact that more than 80 percent of persons arrested during demonstrations for a wide variety of offenses forfeited collateral as low as \$5 to \$25. It is no wonder violent acts occur with frequency in these demonstrations, for there seems to be little deterrent in the way of possible punishment.

I was somewhat amazed to read in the Washington Evening Star, Tuesday, of the announcement by Chief Judge Harold H. Greene of the court of general sessions, announcing the rescinding of a May order increasing the collateral on misdemeanors arising out of demonstrations.

I was pleased that Judge Greene asked his fellow judges to make a complete study of the question of collateral in such offenses, to determine whether the current flexible method is effective. I would submit, however, that his decision to lower the collateral from \$50 to \$10 is a step in the wrong direction, and appears to me to be especially ill timed in light of the fact that the most recent protest demonstrations, occurring over the Fourth of July weekend, again produced substantial private and public property damage, and injuries to 24 Metropolitan Police officers and 17 Park Policemen.

I think we should ask the police officer who had his jaw broken by one of the "flower children" involved in the most recent demonstration, whether he believes the ridiculously low collateral is a deterrent. Surely the youth who pushed a brick in the face of that officer did not fear much punishment for his act.

Of the 63 arrests over the Fourth of July weekend, 21 were allowed free by paying collateral of \$50, and another 19 were released after paying \$10 collateral.

Again, let me remind my colleagues what collateral is. Collateral is a fee to be paid by the arrested individual in lieu of his arrest. By paying it, that closes the case if he forfeits. It is in essence a small fine. It is not bond, since forfeiture of bond does not close the books on the case.

During the Fourth of July disturbances, 15 youngsters were arrested for throwing missiles at police, and none paid over \$25 in collateral.

Mr. Speaker, my statement of June 26 was meant to be a notice to the local judges that Congress was aware of the problem of collateral. Judge Greene has responded by lowering the collateral, instead of keeping it at least at a more

reasonable level. It is clear to me that Congress, with its special obligation to the people of this city, needs now to step in and take away this discretionary power of the judges to set arbitrarily low collateral fees for what in some jurisdictions must surely be ranked as more serious than a fine the equivalent to a parking ticket. If the Metropolitan Police are to maintain order, and if the local merchants are to have any safety for their property, and if the local citizens and tourists are to have any feeling of safety for their person, then we in Congress must act, for apparently the judges are not going to act effectively.

I am preparing legislation which will correct this matter, and I will be speaking on this matter again in the near future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS ON SOUTH-EAST ASIA INVESTIGATION

(Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

LOGISTIC SANCTUARIES

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the comments relative to logistic sanctuaries are submitted at the risk of belaboring a very obvious point.

Two-thirds of the war materials and very important food imports sustaining the North Vietnamese war effort arrive by sea through the port of Haiphong. While our own intelligence was slow to ascertain the fact, it is now apparent that most of the materials in the Cambodian sanctuaries arrived not via the Ho Chi Minh Trail but by sea through Sihanoukville. As impressive as were the quantities of supplies taken by U.S. and ARVN forces in Cambodia, the entire quantity, nonetheless, could be replaced by one shipload. Fortunately, the South Vietnamese Navy is now trying to seal off the Cambodian coast. This is one of the most important steps taken in the war to date.

War supplies and food are shipped to North Vietnam by the Soviet Union, Red China, and other nations. By far the more important source is the Soviet Union and the satellite nations, to whom the North Vietnamese have their strongest ideological and other ties. The Vietnamese do not trust mainland China.

While it is very apparent that North Vietnam wants South Vietnam for its own purposes, the ability of the north to sustain the war is very much dependent on the logistics train arriving by sea from the Soviet Union, and others. The ports requisite to the functioning of this train, mainly Haiphong at this point, comprise a logistics sanctuary of infinitely greater

July 8, 1970

H 6503

magnitude than the entire network of Cambodian supply caches.

Thus it is perhaps not an oversimplification to view the war as one in which the Soviets and Red Chinese are exploiting the incredibly adept North Vietnamese jungle fighters as willing puppets to perpetuate the tying down of U.S. forces and all that involves—tens of thousands of lives lost—a large part of our national resources spent—a rising domestic dissent—and a military establishment whose weapons are being worn out at a time when they should be modernized and replaced for the even more dangerous confrontations which may lie ahead. As is altogether obvious, the Soviets are modernizing and extending their weapons at a furious pace—particularly their sea power.

It is difficult for this Member to rationalize the situation where more than 300 American servicemen die to take a shipload of enemy arms and supplies hidden in Cambodia while scores of replacement shiploads are permitted to proceed unimpeded and unchallenged into Haiphong. We are willing to commit American boys to the ultimate risk of death in the jungle, without shouldering in a national sense, a portion of that risk—the risk involved in demanding that the huge sea logistic train to the north be stopped. If it comes to it, naval authorities agree that Haiphong Harbor could be easily closed, probably without loss of life, by mining, sinking a hulk across the entrance, or by other means. More than likely, this could be accomplished by South Vietnamese forces.

If South Vietnam were willing and successful in taking that step, the rate of Vietnamization of the war, and therefore the U.S. troop withdrawal timetable, could proceed at least twice as fast as currently planned.

The preferable course of action, however, would be the achievement of new U.S. conference table initiatives vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. Virtually the entire world would applaud a bilateral agreement which would lead to an early negotiated peace and the substitution of economic aid for military aid to Vietnam on the part of both the United States and the Soviet Union, in order to rebuild that war torn nation, south and north. The Soviet Union has a moral responsibility to take part in the Paris peace talks for this purpose.

SOUTH VIETNAMESE VIEWPOINT OF U.S. ASSISTANCE

As pointed out in the section on communications in the basic report, the United States and the Government of South Vietnam have not been very effective in explaining the U.S. presence to the Vietnamese people outside of the Government and the armed forces. One gains the impression that while some Vietnamese citizens are genuinely appreciative of U.S. assistance, the majority are not. In some respects this attitude pervades the highest echelons of Government. This member was surprised to hear President Thieu express the rationale that the French had been there, now the Americans—the Americans would probably not be the last—there might be three or four other nations in the future. One could not

help but gain the impression that our assistance is viewed as a somewhat necessary expedient, but of only passing significance.

Closely related to the casual attitude toward U.S. assistance, is a lack of sensitivity within the Thieu government regarding domestic U.S. concern over the war and the phasing out of U.S. forces. This lack of sensitivity unfortunately seems to be shared by some in civilian components of the U.S. ambassadorial country team. It is with a deep sense of personal regret to so report, but this member feels a moral obligation to suggest that we have arrived at a juncture where the necessary leverage upon the Thieu government for rapid Vietnamization and urgently required economic and other reforms can only be applied through new U.S. ambassadorial leadership in Saigon. Ambassador Bunker is a superb American who has rendered vast service to his country. The foregoing comments should not be interpreted as derogatory in any respect. It is merely an effort to appraise a difficult, confusing, and rapidly changing situation realistically. Any other person, no matter how able, would equally have been forced into a position of diminishing alternatives in dealing with the government of a nation seeking self-determination under such difficult circumstances.

CON SON NATIONAL PRISON

By virtue of U.S. aid involvement in the South Vietnamese national prison system, this Member was one of two who visited Con Son National Prison. While there, partially due to advance intelligence, but mainly through happenstance, we gained admittance to a prison compound known as the "tiger cage" area. The treatment of South Vietnamese civilian prisoners in this area can only be described as inhumane and shocking. Throughout the prison severe problems of malnutrition, vitamin deficiencies, tuberculosis and other deficiencies of deep concern exist. A detailed report of conditions is contained in the supplementary views of Congressman HAWKINS.

While one may legitimately argue as to the basic wisdom of our involvement in that nation's prison system, we are, nonetheless, involved. What we must do now is to insist on immediate prison reforms in the name of humaneness, and immediate reforms to the South Vietnamese legal processes in the name of justice. Setting aside for a moment the humane factors, any system where a citizen can be jailed and held 2 years without trial by little more than an administrative action of the part of a Provincial council is bound to involve some innocent people and to be counterproductive to self-determination of government and to viable anti-Communist democratic progress.

Because we are already involved and because of this Nation's dedication to justice and humane treatment of all, we cannot stop at the mere insistence of reform—we must provide suitable advisers and suitable material resources to carry out those reforms if we are to continue to support the existing Saigon government.

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KOCH's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TAX EXEMPTION ON THE FIRST \$500 OF INTEREST RECEIVED FROM SAVINGS ACCOUNT DE- POSITS IN LENDING INSTITU- TIONS

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the greatest roadblock to meeting the housing needs of the 1970's presently is in the availability of mortgage money for homes. The President has made clear the high priority which the administration attaches to various programs to assist in the production of needed housing. The 1971 budget contemplates outlays of \$3,781,000 for community development and housing but the housing needs are so great that this deals with only a small percentage of the mortgage problem. Although the administration realizes the housing industry faces a crisis, more assistance must be given to thrift institutions which specialize in home mortgages. Savings and Loans have been providing about 45 percent of all the home loan money in the United States. Unless enough funds are saved in savings and loan associations and other financial institutions which similarly engage in the financing of homes, our housing crisis is going to be with us for a long time. Anything short of providing increased deposits to these institutions would only serve a short-term emergency purpose.

Today, I am introducing a measure aimed at shoring up the housing market by excluding from gross income the first \$500 of interest received from savings account deposits in lending institutions. Such a tax incentive would provide an immediate spur for investment in these institutions by indirectly raising the effective yield to the small and middle saver to a very attractive level. Of course in fairness it should be pointed out that exempting the first \$500 of earnings paid to savers might mean a revenue loss to the U.S. Treasury initially of approximately \$1 billion annually. However, I am sure that this figure would be more than offset by increased taxes stimulated from the added employment in the building trades, and it would certainly reduce the need for additional Federal appropriations to subsidize housing under the many Federal programs which are currently under consideration. A tax exemption for savers would encourage people to save more and this would tend to break the inflationary trend in the economy and would certainly be the best means of solving the crisis the housing industry faces in the 1970's.

The bill follows:

H.R. 18362

A bill to exclude from gross income the first \$500 of interest received from savings account deposits in lending institutions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of Amer-

in Congress assembled, That part III of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 123 as section 124 and by inserting after section 122 the following new section:

"Sec. 123 Dividends From Savings Account Deposits In Lending Institutions.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Gross income does not include amounts received by, or credited to the account of, a taxpayer as dividends or interest on savings deposits or withdrawable savings accounts in lending institutions as this term is defined by section 581 of part I of subchapter H of chapter 1 and by section 691 of part II of subchapter H of chapter 1.

"(b) LIMITATION.—The exclusion allowed to each taxpayer under this section shall in the aggregate not exceed \$500 for any taxable year, and shall be allowed only once for taxpayers filing a joint return."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

FARM LABOR HOUSING LEGISLATION

(Mr. TUNNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, farmworkers are among the lowest paid of any working group in the country. They also live in some of the worst housing. Migrant farmworkers, especially, are relegated to some of the most unsanitary living conditions and shelters known anywhere. That we as a people, and a government, should allow this to happen—yes, even condone it—is criminal.

Some efforts to solve the problem have been attempted, but they are only scratching the surface. In my own State, the California Office of Economic Opportunity, with financial assistance from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, have constructed over 2,000 temporary structures which are used by migrants during the harvest seasons. But they only provide minimum shelter, and California is the only State in which they have been built. The only other Federal Government agency attempting to solve the problem is the Farmers Home Administration.

Since 1962, that agency has been authorized to make loans at 5-percent interest to owners of farms, associations of farmers, States or their political subdivisions, and to public and private non-profit organizations.

Since 1965, that agency has been authorized to provide grants of up to two-thirds of the total development costs of a project to States and their political subdivisions and public and private non-profit organizations. These funds are earmarked to provide needed housing for our farmworker population.

Since 1962, over \$60 million has been made available for loans and over \$16 million has been appropriated for grants. The tragic realities of the program are, however, that of these funds only about \$16 million has been made in loans and \$12 million has been made in grants. Thus, the program as a whole is operating at less than 40 percent of its authority.

A little over 4,000 units have been repaired or constructed for families of farmworkers and other units have been repaired or constructed which will house over 4,000 individual workers. The need for more and better housing is, of course, many times greater than this. Why, then, has the program not done better?

The grant program was originated so that organizations could provide housing at a rent that farm workers could afford. Congress authorized that grants could be made for up to two-thirds of the development cost of the project. In the first appropriations act, however, the committee strongly voiced its opposition to grants which would exceed 50 percent. To date, of the 16 organizations that have received grants, only five have been in excess of 50 percent. With large loans to repay, because of this restriction on grants, many organizations probably find it economically impossible to enter the farm labor housing field. In areas where farm labor is not needed year-around, a grant of two-thirds of the total development cost may not be sufficient to enable the organization to charge reasonable rents for income to pay back the loans required for the balance of the costs.

Another problem which will tend to retard the program even more, is a decision by the Farmers Home Administration to exclude all organizations except public bodies from receiving grants. This seems to be directly contrary to intent of the original legislation.

In many areas where farm labor housing is needed, public housing authorities—the only public bodies who have thus far received grants—do not exist or are not sensitive to farm workers' needs. To date, several broad based organizations have received grants, but administrative regulations required them to have a majority of their directors live within the geographic area of the site of the project and the farms on which the laborers work.

The most fatal flaw of the program is that the ultimate beneficiaries of the program, the farmworkers themselves, are ineligible as a group to receive the funds. Prior to passage of the legislation, the Farmers Home Administration recommended that groups of farmworkers be the only private organization eligible to receive grants, but on the other hand recommended that farmworkers not be eligible for loans since they already were covered under the regular homeownership program, as individuals.

These are but a few of the roadblocks, either built into the legislation or subsequently placed there by the administration, that prevent it from solving the problems that Congress intended. There are undoubtedly many more, not the least of which is the exhaustive application requirements that must be met prior to receiving these funds.

If our Nation's farmworkers are to benefit from this program to the extent Congress intended, then perhaps it is time that Congress reexamined it. If mistakes have been made, then there is still time to correct them. But time is running out, for the condition of the housing in which the farmworkers live, is growing worse, not better.

Today I am introducing legislation to revamp and expand the farm labor housing program.

First, this legislation would authorize nonprofit organizations of farmworkers to be eligible to receive loans and grants for constructing or repairing low-rent housing and would revoke a Farmers Home Administration decision that only public bodies would be eligible for grants.

Second, it would authorize grants for up to 90 percent of the total cost of a farm labor housing project.

Third, it would recommend that chartered nonprofit organizations be allowed to build farm labor housing anywhere within the State of its incorporation where a need can be established.

Fourth, the bill recommends that, whenever possible, farm labor housing be constructed for year-round living.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEPPER, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. DENNEY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 8 and 9, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Crime.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FISH) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHADEBERG, for 15 minutes, Thursday, July 9.

Mr. TAFT, for 15 minutes, Thursday, July 9.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BLANTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA), to revise and extend his remarks following those of Mr. MATSUNAGA during general debate today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FISH) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 116

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 1970

No. 114

House of Representatives *UN*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit.—Matthew 7: 17.

We open our minds unto Thee, our Father, and pray that Thy spirit may come anew into our hearts, giving us power for the living of these days. Remove from within us any bitterness that blights our lives, any resentment that ruins our dispositions, and any worry that wearies us and wears us out.

Help us to think cleanly and clearly, to speak forcefully and faithfully, to work heartily and hopefully, and to live trustfully and truly. In this spirit may we learn to do what is best for our country and good for our world.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1284. Joint resolution authorizing the President's Commission on Campus Unrest to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5365. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands held under color of title to Mrs. Jessie L. Gaines of Mobile, Ala.; and

H.R. 17548. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and

Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17548) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 16595) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3838. An act to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Johnny Horizon", and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS ON SOUTH-EAST ASIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests to make. One is that my supplemental views on the investigation in Southeast Asia by the select committee be included in that report as a supplemental report; and, second, that my supplemental views be included in the RECORD as of today so that the readers may have those views available to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DEPRAVED TREATMENT OF PRISONERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. TUNNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the revelations in the last couple of days that have been brought out to the Nation by my colleagues, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON), and the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS), regarding Con Son prison and the depraved treatment of POW's and political prisoners shows very clearly that it is not just the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong who treat in such a fashion people of their own race and of their own nation with whom they are at war. It is also the Saigon Government which participates in cruel and inhuman handling of their prisoners.

The fact that U.S. dollars are supporting such an effort and the fact that American advisers are over there advising the Vietnamese makes it clear how far you can have a bureaucracy become completely insensate to the problems of man's inhumanity to man.

I am afraid that this is another example of what this Asian war has done to our spirit as a nation. I want to make it very clear that I do not think it is the fault of the Nixon administration any more than I think it is the fault of the Johnson administration. But I think the fault lies in the endeavor—this military endeavor—which can lead a moral nation like the United States—a generous nation like the United States and allow its visions of charitable sacrifice to produce monsters.

This, it seems to me, necessitates a Presidential commission to go over and take a look at what is going on in Con Son, and other political prisons in South Vietnam so that when we speak about inhuman treatment of American prisoners of war, we may speak with the knowledge that we are doing everything we can to keep the Vietnamese—be they South Vietnamese or North Vietnamese—to keep prisoners from being treated inhumanly in our prisons or in prisons sponsored by our client government in Saigon.

H 6435

July 8, 1970

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KOCH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE PLIGHT OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended a tour of the Kingsbridge VA Hospital. This tour was part of the investigation which was undertaken by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Both the committee headed by Mr. TEAGUE and the Subcommittee on Hospitals headed by Mr. HALEY have devoted considerable man-hours to probing what is happening with the Nation's VA hospitals. What they found is shocking, especially in New York VA hospitals.

As Mr. TEAGUE noted:

The Vietnam veteran has contributed enough when he fights the shooting war and he should not be expected to fight the inflation war at the expense of his health.

Yet, I have seen the heroes of battles living in continual tragedy.

We are not doing all we can when we allot 11,000 beds in New York VA hospitals to serve more than 2½ million veterans. And we are shirking our duty when we permit our New York VA hospitals to be short staffed by more than 3,300 hospital personnel.

Can you believe our veterans' hospitals have half the attendants that private hospitals have to care for paraplegics—men who cannot move. Are the veteran paraplegics half as much men?

How can we expect men to get well when they are given half a chance to be rehabilitated? As a result, we are finding ever-increasing numbers of veterans who are permanent hospital residents. We are not helping them enough, so they are not able to return to society.

CONGRESS SHOULD LEAD THE WAY

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations (Mr. MAHON) addressed the House on the subject of the deteriorating Federal budgetary situation. He warned the Congress of the President's reestimated fiscal 1971 deficit, excluding trust funds, and that the Federal Government would be \$11 billion in the red.

Meanwhile, the national debt has climbed, as of June 30, the end of the Government's fiscal year, to \$373 billion.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has to deal with inflation and this overspending, and in this connection, I would suggest that we set an example ourselves by reducing our own salaries and the salaries of all top jobs in Government, including the Presi-

dent and Cabinet members by at least 10 percent.

The dollars thereby saved would not make much of a dent in the deficit, but it would set an example in the way of establishing a pattern of restraint in the fight against inflation.

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot ask others to do something which itself is unwilling to do. If voluntary restraints are to work, the Government should lead the way.

THE SILENT MAJORITY SPEAKS

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, yes, there is a silent majority.

And 300,000 to 400,000 of them turned out in the Capital of their Nation Saturday night to honor America.

Americans from every State and every city and almost every crossroads of the Nation came to pray, and to salute their flag, and to listen to their fellow patriots and to celebrate the independence of the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a silent majority. And it consists of something like 95 percent of the American people—the decent, honest hardworking Americans who respect the rights of others, who love liberty and love their country, who obey her laws, and who serve her in her hour of need.

These are the people who were represented here on Saturday night.

And it is they who will defend a great America today and will build a better America tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, we should all thank God for the fact that America does indeed have a silent and patriotic and law-abiding majority.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this week, from July 12 to July 18, has been designated "Captive Nations Week." Congress has set aside 1 week for this purpose every year since the resolution was passed in 1959 to remind us of what we, in our good fortune, are liable to forget: that 1 billion people remain shackled in the chains of Communist domination.

Compared to the sufferings of the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe and Communist Asia, the cries of repression of academic freedoms and police brutality in this country seem merely ludicrous. Paradoxically, the government which allows the greatest freedom of dissent is the most frequent target of criticism while the Communist system which permits none is outwardly calm and undivided by dissent. But it is an uneasy quiet which prevails in the streets of Communist citadels, a tenuous political peace born out of the barrel of a gun.

The citizens—we should rather call them subjects—of these countries rarely

and at great peril to themselves raise their voices in protest. But they are none the less patriotic for that. They are the silent allies of freedom. They wait patiently for some sign of hope. And they will no doubt be, when their countries are finally liberated, the staunchest defenders of freedom, for they know from bitter experience what it means to live without it. I understand this because I have relatives behind the Iron Curtain in Hungary and East Germany.

We must not forget them and we must not fail them. Freedom is not merely the prerogative of Americans, but the precious heritage of all mankind of which we are privileged to act as guardians. We must be watchful lest it slip from our unwitting grasp. We cannot surrender to those who would threaten it from without and we cannot capitulate to those who would undermine it from within.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EMERGENCY PUBLIC INTEREST PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, congressional inaction on President Nixon's Emergency Public Interest Protection Act of 1970 is absolutely incomprehensible.

We have had a sudden strike against the Nation's railroads. The President has aborted the strike by employing his authority under the Railway Labor Act to order the men back to work for 60 days while an Emergency Board studies the situation and recommends a settlement. Now Northwest Airlines has also been struck.

These actions point up the absurdity of the position in which the Nation finds itself.

The country is without adequate means to deal with national emergency labor disputes in transportation and yet hearings have not even been scheduled in either the House or the Senate on the President's proposed Emergency Public Interest Protection Act.

It was last February 27 that the President sent Congress a message detailing his proposal covering emergency disputes in the transportation industries. Why has no action been taken? Why such disputes reach the point where Congress has to legislate a special solution which in most cases amounts to compulsory arbitration? I think these questions demand an answer. I think the American people will insist upon an answer.

As President Nixon has pointed out, the Railway Labor Act has a very bad record. It discourages genuine collective bargaining.

The President's Emergency Public Interest Protection Act is designed to promote collective bargaining—to promote a solution short of special congressional action in a crisis atmosphere. This makes sense to me, and it should make sense to every other Member of Congress.

I urge that the Congress move immediately to consider the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act.

July 8, 1970

H 6493

dollar spiral in the nuclear arms race. Why wasn't this just as inflationary, if not more so?

Only a few days ago Congress overrode another Nixon veto and so restored funds to build desperately needed hospitals and mental health facilities for the nation's sick people. The President turned down this bill because he said it was inflationary. But more than two-thirds of Congress—including a majority of the members of the Republican Party—voted to allocate for hospitals some of the money cut from the budget.

National priorities? Let's consider again each American's thousand dollar share of the nation's budget: \$4.50 for air and water pollution; \$5.00 for urban renewal for our cities; \$7.50 for elementary and secondary education; 50 cents for training the handicapped—and \$375.00 for the military.

Once again, we must look to Congress for leadership.

It was Congress that more than doubled President Nixon's initial request for an increase in social security, providing a badly needed 15 percent increase. And just this week, your paychecks will be larger because a Democratic Congress voted to increase personal tax exemptions and eliminated the 5 percent surtax.

So I ask you tonight: Who is really engaged in a "historic reordering of our national priorities"—the Congress or the President?

One of our most urgent priorities for this decade is cleaning up our environment. Most of you heard the President speaking to this problem in his State of the Union Message this past January.

Nixon. The program I shall propose to Congress will be the most comprehensive and costly program in this field in America's history.

It is not a program for just one year. A year's plan in this field is no plan at all. This is a time to look ahead not a year, but 5 years or 10 years—whatever time is required to do the job.

I shall propose to this Congress a \$10 billion nationwide clean waters program to put modern municipal waste treatment plants in every place in America where they are needed to make our waters clean again, and do it now. (State of the Union Message, Jan. 22, 1970)

O'BRIEN. That is what President Nixon said he would propose, and to many it seemed an impressive call for action. But the fact is that the 10 billion dollar program he promised calls for federal spending of only four billion dollars. The amount Mr. Nixon proposed for the first year of his new program to fight water pollution turned out to be less than Congress had already authorized.

And so, 18 months later, the pattern of the Nixon Administration's domestic program is abundantly clear—ringing calls for action, but few results, except when Congress takes the initiative and calls the shots.

But our attention to our critical domestic priorities continues to be diverted by the seemingly endless struggle in Indochina, about which the President addressed the nation on April 30.

Nixon. Tonight, American and South Vietnamese units will attack the headquarters for the entire Communist military operation in South Vietnam. This key control center has been occupied by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong for 5 years in blatant violation of Cambodia's neutrality. (Address to Nation, April 30, 1970)

O'BRIEN. I have no intention of "taking on" the President in difficult decisions about military strategy, but I do want the President to level with all of us.

I share the relief of all Americans that our troops have crossed back into South Vietnam, but I also share the confusion of most Americans who wonder what Cambodia is really all about.

The President never consulted with his Cabinet or with Congress before he expanded the Indochina war. He has never told the American people that the Communist headquarters he said would be attacked was never attacked and apparently never even located.

Instead Mr. Nixon now has given other reasons to justify his surprise move of American troops into a neutral country, among them the preservation of a new Cambodian government.

And now we have become involved, whether or not we like it, in that new government. Now—although our ground troops are out—our bombers and our artillery continue to bomb the Cambodian nation. Now the South Vietnamese army continues to sustain a full scale military operation in Cambodia.

Before our military incursion, as this map shows, Communist activity in Cambodia was primarily limited to border sanctuaries.

But now, just two months later, Communist control has expanded to half the land area of Cambodia and Communists have infiltrated over a large part of the rest of the beleaguered country.

The question must be asked: Has our action actually saved Cambodia, or put its survival in greater jeopardy?

To be a patriotic American is to question and probe the activities of those who govern us. That is our duty and our right.

The newly elected President promised to "bring us together again." But the opposite of that is occurring, polarization, unfortunately encouraged by Vice President Agnew in speech after speech across the country.

Agnew. You can't bring 200 million people together. Let's stop talking in technicalities and look at the President's figure of speech—was a plea for national unity to bring the responsible elements of our society together. But let's never overlook the fact that there are also irresponsible elements of our society and instead of attempting to dignify and condone what they're doing, let's polarize—let's get rid of these undesirable people by recognizing that they cannot participate in our legitimate processes of government unless they play the rules. (Washington Window, UPI Interview, November 16, 1969)

O'BRIEN. The words and thoughts of Vice President Agnew leave me saddened and disheartened. While I realize there are many who support Mr. Agnew, I deeply believe his road can only lead to further division and mistrust among our people.

In attacking the loyalty of millions who sincerely question the course of the present Administration, the Vice President is himself questioning and jeopardizing the very democratic tradition that has made us strong.

Is this the way we are to be brought together again? Is this the lowered voice President Nixon urged upon all of us eighteen months ago?

This is a time for healing, not for wounding, for trust and understanding, not for hatred and suspicion.

For 14 years, I was a friend and close associate of a man who could express these feelings far better than I. One bright, wintry day the world seemed full of promise as he reached out to us and summoned forth the best we Americans had to offer.

KENNEDY. All of this will not be finished in the first one hundred days. Nor will it be finished in the first one thousand days, nor in the life of this Administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin... (Kennedy Inaugural Address, Jan. 20, 1961)

O'BRIEN. The Democratic Party, and the Democrats in Congress accepted that challenge a decade ago—and we rededicate ourselves today.

WAR OF THE WORLDS

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from California, Mr. MURPHY, has come up with a most unique view of how the United States should conduct its international relations. It is simply this—and I quote him:

There can be no such thing as a politically-established sanctuary from which an enemy can attack American forces and into which he can retreat without fear of pursuit.

The Senator looked back into history for justification of this remarkable view. He cited the American punishment of the Barbary Coast pirates and even General Pershing's raids into Mexico against Pancho Villa. He compares these events with America's most recent excursions into Cambodia. In fact, he calls them a quote—"striking parallel"—unquote.

I gather from his remarks, which were delivered on the Senate floor June 29, that he wholeheartedly endorses such a policy and recommends that our country diligently pursue and punish militarily all those who aid the North Vietnamese Communists. That, of course, is the next step.

There is only one fly in this ointment. America would be at war with half of the world if the Senator's views were adopted. After all, much of North Vietnam's help comes from Red China and Russia. So it would be only logical to attack the sources of this aid. Many other countries have traded with or aided North Vietnam. The Library of Congress informs me that this list includes at least 26 countries.

Among them are: Albania, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, North Korea, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, France, West Germany, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United Arab Republic, Japan, The Netherlands, Algeria, Norway, and I am sure there are also a number of others.

So it is clear we would take up arms and invade or bomb literally hundreds of cities and many countries, including some of our best allies under the Senator's policy proposal. I do not think we have enough napalm to do that despite the billions of dollars we spend on the military.

I will say, however, it gives the military-industrial complex another argument to press for higher appropriations. They can now give up that old chestnut of enemy submarines being sighted off the coast of Newfoundland or South America every time the military budget comes up.

I would like to suggest most respectfully to the talented senior Senator from California that he turn his ingenious creativity to solving some of America's most pressing domestic problems. To help him in this effort, I will be most happy to identify some of these problems for him. They include inflation, air and water pollution, poverty, hunger,

H 6494

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 8, 1970

civil rights, medical care, drug abuse, consumer protection, the decay of our cities and—I might add—the decay of our moral responsibility to the world to make it a better and more peaceful place for all human beings.

VIETNAM INVESTIGATION

(Mr. WOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to praise the 12-member factfinding committee this body sent to Vietnam.

Whatever the differences in their findings, I am certain the information they came back with will be beneficial toward guiding this body and the Government of the United States in its future Southeast Asian policy.

I am greatly concerned about Southeast Asia and its impact on the domestic well-being of this Nation. I am equally concerned about the effect of this Government's policies on our relations with the remainder of the world. In these two areas, I believe President Nixon has provided very able leadership. He is committed to removing U.S. military forces from Vietnam in the shortest possible time under honorable and tolerable conditions.

Nonetheless, certain revelations of the factfinding group have come as a brutal shock to me. I refer to the tentative findings of two members of the group about the prison on Conson Island and, specifically to the tiger cages there.

The morality of the situation is evil enough, but at a more human level, I would like to know why the United States has allowed the South Vietnamese Government to jeopardize the fate of the 1,508 Americans missing or held prisoner of war by the Communists. I think the American people deserve all the answers. They certainly deserve more than the terrible ironic headlines of this morning's Washington Post: "U.S. denies Responsibility for 'Tiger Cages' at Conson."

American prisoners of war in North Vietnam are being endangered by what may be going on in South Vietnam. Rather than denials or evasions of responsibility, we need to know what is going on in South Vietnam. These claims of ignorance and nonaction will only be used as excuses by the North Vietnamese to continue mistreating and holding American prisoners of war. Neither the American people nor the loved ones of our missing men should tolerate such a situation.

I do not say the analogy is perfect, but I remember all too clearly the misuse to which the excuse of "ignorance" has been put. Both the highest and lowest German officials—after World War II—denied any knowledge of what was happening all over Europe. The situation in South Vietnam is not of the scale of Europe. Nor is the intent of the South Vietnamese Government the same as was that of the Nazis. Nonetheless, ignorance is no excuse.

The following questions should be answered by the appropriate officials:

First. How long has the situation at Conson existed?

Second. How long has the United States known about it?

Third. How long has the United States been trying to straighten it out?

Fourth. What has been the degree of political influence used to straighten it out?

Fifth. What has been the degree of moral persuasion used on the South Vietnamese Government?

Sixth. What other means of influence have been used?

Seventh. Who are the officials who know about the situation?

Eighth. How strenuously did they try to inform higher authorities of the situation?

Ninth. Are there similar situations elsewhere?

Tenth. Was any attempt made to link the effect of Conson with the treatment that would be accorded U.S. prisoners held by the Communists?

I believe the Departments of State and Defense have an obligation and duty to fully answer these questions for the appropriate House and Senate committees. Anyone else with information relating to these developments should be free to tell what they know. I would hope this body and the appropriate committees would welcome all such information.

The reports of Conson have brought out another shocking situation that needs to be investigated. From my reading of the reports, it is clear that the reporters have long been kept out of the area. We need to know if the United States has protested their exclusion.

We need to know if there are other areas in South Vietnam—where thousands of Americans have died and billions of our dollars spent—where the U.S. press is not permitted.

I am aware of the sensitivity about stepping on toes of our allies. But, I believe these questions are deserving of an answer. After all, the South Vietnamese press is allowed to freely wander about the United States and, as we all know, the South Vietnamese Government is not spending a dime of its own money in the United States.

There are other sources of information to learn what is happening. Private groups such as the Red Cross, the International Voluntary Service Organization, the World Council of Churches, and others are vast storehouses of knowledge. They all, along with the members of the press, should be queried about these cages and about other items which have been suppressed that will affect our prisoners being held by the North Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the committee's trip to South Vietnam has sparked a controversy. I am sure, however, that each member is well prepared to answer for his own experiences.

My concern is the American prisoners in North Vietnam and how Conson affects them. We should be asking the question: What can we learn from this experience that will help us get our men out of North Vietnam prisons?

There will be some who wonder about the validity of these questions. There will be some who say why are you trying to stir up trouble.

The answer is simple. The lives and fate of our American men being held by

the North Vietnamese overrides all other considerations.

I call on all Members of this body, whether or not they support our effort in Vietnam, to join in protest at any violation of the rules of the Geneva Convention on Treatment of Prisoners of War. This is a double-edged sword which must apply to American prisoners in North Vietnam as well as to the enemy in Conson.

THE MIDDLE EAST: TIME RUNNING OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PHILBIN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that Russia intends to press ahead in the Middle East to stake out her strategic claims and to consolidate her position with ruthless determination. She will continue to back and encourage the Arabs in every way as and when it serves her interests, just as she has been feeding and stoking the fires of conflict in Vietnam.

As the Intelligence Digest published in England pointed out, Egypt is now the principal springboard of the expansion and consolidation of Moscow's influence and, Moscow hopes, eventual domination. As in the case of totally subjugated Czechoslovakia, for instance, there now seems to be no way of escape from the clutches of dependency in sight for Russia's Middle East clients.

No matter how extraordinarily difficult and unpleasant though it may be to look the danger-fraught realities straight in the face, it would be merely postponing the moment of truth to cling to the hope that the diplomatic possibilities of solving the problem of Russian penetration in the Middle East have not yet been exhausted.

It is wishful thinking to expect that Russia, after having gained so much already, will withdraw voluntarily in a spirit of compromise and goodwill.

Indeed, the statesmen of the West are unlikely to be so naive as to have much confidence in this. They can see the writing on the wall clearly enough, but evidently still hope against hope that it is not really true.

When Khrushchev tried through the Cuban venture to redraw the strategic map of the world, the United States nipped the attempt in the bud with an ultimatum to the Kremlin which undoubtedly carried the risk of a third World War.

This was a calculated risk, which had to be taken, and was taken, in order to avert certain catastrophe.

Today, President Nixon, who has been faced by a near-hysterical mood of neo-isolationism at home at a time when as critical a situation is in the making, has had so far to confine himself to exhorting the Russian leaders "to cooperate, please."

All the indications are that the Russian leaders are growing increasingly

SECRET

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Tuesday - 7 July 1970

Page 2

25X1

4. [] - JGO) Met with Mr. Frank Slatinshek, Assistant Chief Counsel, House Armed Services Committee, and reviewed with him in general [] throughout the country. Since [] was not available to take part in the discussion today, it was agreed that a briefing be arranged for later by the Director, [] or his deputy. [] has been advised.

25X1

25X1

25X1A

25X1C

I received from Mr. Slatinshek copies of correspondence between Chairman Rivers and Representative Henderson concerning

25X1

6. [] - JGO) Talked to Buddy Hendericks, Publications Editor, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who told me that publication of the Colby/Van testimony has been delayed again in favor of other Vietnam hearings. No date for publication has been scheduled.

25X1

7. [] - JGO) While on the Hill I ran into Harry Cromer, Staff Consultant, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, who told me that Chairman Murphy is planning hearings in about a month and may well desire an updating of the information previously provided by the Agency on China and the Soviet Union. I thanked Mr. Cromer for the information.

25X1A

25X1

8. [] JMM) Accompanied the Director and [] who briefed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Agency [] Southeast Asia and the Middle East. See Memo for Record and transcript.

25X1C

25X1C

SECRET

Americans Find Brutality In South Vietnamese Jail

By GLORIA EMERSON
Special to The New York Times

SAIGON, South Vietnam, July 6 — An American who visited South Vietnam's largest civilian prison last Thursday reported here today on what he described as the inhuman conditions and intimidation existing there.

Don Luce, who is gathering information in Vietnam for the Division of InterChurch Aid of the World Council of Churches, said that 500 of the 9,900 prisoners believed to be on the island known as Con Son were confined in small stone compartments, and that many of the prisoners were unable to stand. The prisoners, he said, suffer from malnutrition, physical abuse and filthy conditions.

Mr. Luce was able to visit the island, which is 140 miles southeast of Saigon, because of Augustus F. Hawkins, a Democrat from the Watts area in Los Angeles, and Representative William R. Anderson, Democrat of Tennessee. The group was accompanied by a Congressional aide, Thomas Harkin, who photographed the worst of the prisons.

The legislators were in South Vietnam as part of a 12-man House committee that made on a fact-finding tour on the United States' involvement in Asia.

Newsman Are Barred

Access to the prison is denied to newsmen. South Vietnamese officials generally deny that conditions are extremely harsh on the island, which is often referred to by its French name, Polo Condor.

The small stone compartments, known to the Vietnamese as tiger cages, were not voluntarily shown to the American visitors. The purpose of the trip had been to see if they existed.

Attempts to prevent the inspection were made by the warden, Col. Nguyen Van Ve. Mr. Luce also asserts that when the legislators asked to see six specific prisoners — four students, the editor of a French-language daily newspaper closed by the Government and another man — the colonel became angry. Mr. Luce had supplied the prisoners' names to the legislators.

After insisting that a telegram be sent to the Ministry of the Interior in Saigon asking permission for the group to see the six prisoners, Colonel Ve, according to Mr. Luce, said in Vietnamese to his own aide: "Do not worry about getting an answer — the important thing is to send it."

The warden did not know that Mr. Luce, who has been in South Vietnam for more than 11 years, speaks Vietnamese fluently.

According to Mr. Luce, Frank E. Walton, the American who heads the Public Safety Directorate — an advisory program in South Vietnam under the wing of Civil Operations-Revolutionary Development, supported the warden in his attempts to block the visitors.

"Walton suggested we visit the curio shop," Mr. Luce continued. "He was angry to see me with the Congressmen and said, 'I thought this trip was above board — Luce has misrepresented everything in Vietnam.'"

Mr. Luce, who is 35 years old and came here in 1958 as a volunteer social-service worker, has been an outspoken critic of United States involvement in Vietnam and of the Saigon Government.

Mr. Luce, who had been told of a hidden entry to the tiger cages, saw a tiny gate. Representative Hawkins asked Colonel Ve to have the door opened after the warden had said it was not possible. A

guard, hearing the warden's voice, opened the door and the Americans went inside with the warden at their heels.

"We looked down from a catwalk through large openings—one for each cell," Mr. Luce related. "These were the tiger cages which are not supposed to exist anymore."

He said that in the presence of Colonel Ve the Americans visited two buildings composed of what he described as airless, hot, filthy stone compartments. In the building for men, according to Mr. Luce, three or four prisoners are in each compartment, which seemed not quite 5 feet across and 9 feet long.

"It was high enough for the prisoners to stand up but none of the men did," he related. "They dragged themselves to the spot where they could look up and speak to us. The men claimed they were beaten, that they were very hungry because they were only given rice that had sand and pebbles in it."

The prisoners also pleaded for water, Mr. Luce said, and cried out that they were sick and had no medicine.

Above each compartment, Mr. Luce related, was a bucket of powdery white lime that Colonel Ve said was used for whitewashing the walls but that the prisoners said was thrown down on them when they asked for food.

The women prisoners, who numbered about 250, told Mr. Luce, he said, that they were moved from mainland prisons seven months ago. They had the same complaints, he added, and also said there was no water for washing.

He said there appeared to be 60 or 70 compartments in each of the two buildings, with five women in a compartment.

When the group came out of the tiger camps after an hour and 15 minutes, Mr. Luce said, they met Mr. Walton, who rebuked them for "intruding" into a Vietnamese prison.

Mr. Luce related that Mr. Hawkins said that he hoped Americans in North Vietnam were not being treated as were the prisoners he had seen.

A fact sheet distributed in Saigon by Mr. Walton's agency over his signature quotes him as describing the "Con Son National Correction Center" as follows:

"In the opinion of correction advisors with lengthy U.S. penology experience, Con Son is not a 'Devil's Island,' but on the contrary is a correctional institution worthy of higher ratings than some prisons in the United States."

Other Facilities Visited

The center was established by the French in 1862 and its name stands for a fearful ordeal. The French, it is said, built the tiger cages.

The legislators and their aide, with Mr. Luce, toured three somewhat more orthodox facilities where groups of prisoners are confined in a large room.

Mr. Luce, who was busy talking with the prisoners, said today that he could not observe whether the conditions were adequate.

"They were terribly scared, very frightened people," Mr. Luce said. "When the guard was not standing near us, the prisoners would tell me that they had never stood trial or been sentenced for any crime and that there was not enough food, water or medical treatment."

"When the prison guards came up," Mr. Luce added, "the prisoner would say to me, 'I am a political prisoner,' and in one instance the guard replied for the man, 'You were arrested because you were a traitor.'"

7 JUL 70

S. Viet Prison Found 'Shocking'

By George C. Wilson
Washington Post Staff Writer

A South Vietnamese prison where men and women are locked up in windowless cages and disciplined with dustings of choking lime was described by two congressmen yesterday.

Reps. William R. Anderson (D-Tenn.) and Augustus F. Hawkins (D-Calif.) provided that description on the basis of their tour of Con Son Island Prison, 60 miles off the South Vietnamese coast on July 2.

"It was the most shocking treatment of human beings I have ever seen," said Anderson, a 49-year-old former sub-

marine officer who won the Bronze Star combat award.

Anderson and Hawkins were part of a House of Representatives fact-finding group that made an on-the-spot assessment of the Vietnam War. They were the only congressmen who toured the prison, where 10,000 persons—most of them held for political offenses—are kept.

The formal report on the trip submitted to the House yesterday contained only one paragraph on Con Son. But Chairman G. V. Montgomery (D-Miss.) of the Special House Committee said "we do not condone" the prison conditions and mentioned it briefly

because "we didn't want to focus the report on it."

Anderson, in an interview, said this is what he saw at Con Son in a tour that started about 9 in the morning and continued until mid-afternoon including a look at the "tiger cages" the South Vietnamese prison commandant tried to keep hidden from the Americans:

He approached a wall of on compound and looked to what he had been told in Saigon would be a hidden door into the tiger cages he had heard about.

See PRISON, A8, Col. 1

House members file report on their visit to Vietnam. Page A9.

PRISON, From A1

"I had been told that the South Vietnamese hid the door with a stack of wood," Anderson said.

Through an interpreter Anderson and Hawkins had brought with them from Saigon to the prison, Anderson asked the commandant to show the Americans the tiger cages. "I had been told they were in Compound 4," Anderson said.

As they stood before an uncamouflaged door in the wall of Compound 4, Anderson pressed the issue of the cages, even asking where that door led.

"He said it was to another compound. But just then—probably because the guard had heard the commandant talking—the door swung open. The commandant looked like a fellow who had dropped his teeth because it was obvious that door did not lead to another compound.

"The commandant," Anderson continued, "had no choice but to let us go inside.

"We saw a one-story foundation with no windows in it of any kind. We went up the stairs to a kind of catwalk and could look down through iron bars about 3/4 of an inch thick at prisoners inside solid concrete cages about 5 by 9 feet."

Anderson said the concrete cages with the iron bar roofs were on either side of the catwalk. Most of the "tiger cages" had five people in them, although a few had three. The walls stretching up to the bars were about six or seven feet high.

"I noticed a box standing over each cage and asked the commandant what was in it. He said sand. I felt it and said I knew it wasn't sand. He then

said it was lime for washing down the walls of the cages. But I could see lime clinging from the iron bars."

With the help of some advance information, Anderson found the evidence compelling that the lime was thrown on the prisoners. "Lime plays the devil with your breathing and nostrils," Anderson said in describing the lime punishment.

No one of the male prisoners was able to stand, Anderson said. They indicated to him by both talk and pointing at their limbs that they had lost the use of their legs. Anderson figured this was either from malnutrition or paralysis from lack of any exercise.

The only visible sanitation facility inside a cage, Anderson said, was a single wood or porcelain container about the size of a waste basket. One straw mat served as sleeping facilities for the five prisoners jammed into the cage, Anderson said.

While he did not see anyone shackled to the wall, the congressman said he saw steel plates evidently designed for ankle shackles in the cages.

After walking over the double line of tiger cages, which Anderson estimated contained about 200 men in 50 cages, the congressional party walked to the corresponding prison for the women prisoners.

There, in a separate building in the same compound, Anderson found a girl who spoke English. She said she was 18 and had been arrested while caught up in a political demonstration. She claimed she herself had not demonstrated but had been imprisoned for seven months at that time, with no bath in two months.

"She said her sister was

somewhere in the compound, was sick but the girl didn't know where she was," Anderson said. "She looked pitiful. Most of the prisoners looked quite thin."

The women, too, evidently got the lime treatment as punishment because the same boxes of it were over the iron gratings. "Some women were standing or could stand," Anderson said, evidencing less severe periods of incarceration.

He estimated there were about 150 women in the tiger cages.

The Agency for International Development escort, former Los Angeles police officer Frank Walton, told the congressmen that there were about 10,000 prisoners in the whole prison complex and only about 35 of them were former prisoners of war.

Walton himself, Anderson said, had never seen the tiger cages before. As part of Walton's job as head of the AID section advising the Thieu Government's national police force and penal system, the former Los Angeles police officer said he visited Con Son once every three months.

Anderson said he told American officials "that there must be an early flight leaving Saigon" for Walton and other AID personnel "who have done such a botched up job" of overseeing prison conditions in South Vietnam.

The American government through AID funds, Anderson said, had spent as much as \$100 million a year to assist the South Vietnamese national police force. The AID figure is below that for this current year, he said.

Since American money links the U.S. to the prison conditions, the findings of the congressmen are likely to embarrass the Nixon administration and provide Hanoi with fresh propaganda ammunition.

The chairman of the interior committee in the South Vietnamese assembly, Anderson said, told him that "their own efforts had not been very successful" in exposing prison treatment. The South Vietnamese assembly chairman, he said, encouraged the Americans to publicize what they had seen at Con Son.

Sickness, especially tuberculosis, is rampant at Con Son, Anderson said. Most of the male prisoners told him they had been imprisoned on the island for "many years."

One prisoner in the part of the compound outside of the tiger cages told Anderson he had been in Con Son 17 years, "received mail once a year and was bad off with TB."

"There is one doctor for the 10,000 prisoners," Anderson said, "and about 20 per cent of them have TB."

"Some of the prisoners in the tiger cages claimed to have been chained and beaten," Anderson said.

Some of the prisoners are suspected Vietcong while others were committed for criminal acts, according to Anderson's findings.

July 1, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 6089

the weekend in 10 cities, including Los Angeles, and more are being sought. Retail value of the drugs seized in the raid, and during the 18 months of investigation which preceded it, was estimated at almost \$9 million.

Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell called the operation a "tremendous success," and predicted that "these arrests will diminish the flow of hard narcotics into and within the United States."

The Justice Dept., the Treasury Dept. and all the other agencies involved deserve a vote of thanks.

THE STATES AND THE SCHOOLS:
LAST CHANCE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the July 1970 issue of American School Board Journal contains a provocative article by Tom McCall, Governor of Oregon, and chairman of the Education Commission of the States. I commend it to the attention of those of you who may have missed it:

THE STATES AND THE SCHOOLS: LAST-CHANCE ALLIANCE

(By Tom McCall)

It is not a flat plane we have here in education. It is a many-faceted extension of the world's bumpy social geography. It is a time of audacious students, angry teachers, bewildered school boards, and parents catatonic with conflict they often seem unable to understand.

But why should we expect otherwise? The entire world is spinning into a new phase of existence. And, as in all phases, we stand forever in danger of losing the fresh, young mind of the student at its most productive moment. We stand forever in danger of selling him out and selling him short; of ignoring the very human signs he flashes to us; of assuming that classrooms—unlike the universe—can stand still.

It is the nature of youth to demand rather than to ask; to question rather than to accept; to embrace tomorrow rather than to revere yesterday; to go beyond bondage rather than run into it. There is much complaint about "campus unrest," be it the campus of a junior high or a famous college. There has been so much talk about it—and so many souffles—that we may be having a counter-reaction. We may be, in 1970, ripe and ready to shut off our reason and open the passion valve.

But—in every carefully considered and thoughtfully written document about this stirring in the young hearts—there is only one recurring message: Listen to them before you condemn them. Listen to what they are saying and attempt to judge why they are saying it. And stop assuming they are automatically wrong because they're making uneasy noises.

We should not forget that it is 5 percent of the students who are throwing bricks and fire bombs. The other 95 percent are throwing ideas. Put out the fires—but don't put out the ideas. And do not make the mistake, nearly all experts urge, of trying to lump the restless students into one growling metaphor. They don't even do that to themselves.

Some students clearly feel that—as far as their sources of education in America are concerned—they are not getting all of the right kind of raw material for building a 21st Century maturity. Speaking of one school, a student said: "Here is where it isn't."

There have been many periods of the dynamic. This is only one. Perhaps we feel it to be more crucial because it's the one we're in. It is not comfortable to be assigned to a dynamic age. It requires constant, alert, and creative participation, or you just get kicked off into the bramble. Not very kindly, but very common.

Perhaps some students are making outrageous demands. But, to and beyond the limit of patience, we must make an effort to translate from the statement of their grievance to the concept of its cause. Then we can perhaps judge.

But these students aren't the only angry segment. Parents have become wary and weary of the whole imbroglio. It sometimes seems they wish merely an end to the noise and a return of elm trees and swimming holes—devoutly to be wished but realistically out of reach.

And the teachers. They are not tall, stern, and quiet in their workshops, either. *Life* magazine recently published an article called "Our Angry Teachers." It had some flaming quotations from members of the profession. A brief sampler:

"We teachers are tired of all this being nice guys; now we're applying some muscle."

"The public rendered us sterile. We never talked about salaries, even though every other profession was demanding more money. Education was left way behind because those who should have been fighting for education were told it was less than professional to do so. Then we teachers were blamed for the bad schools because we remained silent."

"We're bloody and scarred but tougher than ever. And we're not as naive as before. We learned a lot. We learned it takes money to make your point."

"I think the best thing that can happen to the country is a nationwide teacher strike."

We know we have to remake the basic framework of our educational systems in order to stabilize the onrushing future. Innovation must stop being a cliché and start being a rally cry for truly original action. We will have to reassess what a 21st Century curriculum ought to be. We'll have to examine the means and methods of helping the great and growing masses of young, beautiful minds.

Education is not only geared to change. It is the author of change. So we are not facing a brand new problem. We're merely being asked to rediscover the intellectual life that has always been the heritage of all places of learning.

There are basic housekeeping problems: financing; coordination of educational districts; cooperative growth with federal aid; and the sheer logistics of buildings, hardware, software and space.

Those of us with direct connections in educational activity must make all of these assessments immediately. And we'll have to work for the key causes with strident and continuing pressure. We are running out of time.

Gain, for yourself, the sense of urgency that the educational picture generates, and do not overlook the paradoxes: We roar in the streets for the subtle rights and the nuances of educational administration—while there are millions in our society who can't even read what the issues are. For those who deal in education, leadership is their panache. And never before have they been given such a vast field for battle. The complexity of it simply demands that we do not get bogged down in old arguments or in mossy, moldy points of view. America is no longer a quiet expanse of agrarian and small town charm. We have to retool. When the attack came on Pearl Harbor, we recoiled from nothingness to victory; when we decided to stroll on the moon, we did it in massive ease. Now we have an educational moonshot coming up in the 1970s. It is, in every conceivable way, more important than foot-

prints on the moon. And it commands the attention of zealotry, for the job is awesome.

In my state of Oregon, the constitution clearly charges the state to provide for the "establishment of a uniform and general system of common schools."

Even though we have created a series of districts to perform this task, it is, clearly and constitutionally, the state's problem. The success or failure of our general system of common schools must be assigned to the state, where real responsibility lies.

The courts are going to tell us soon and emphatically that we are denying some children a good education because of where they live.

It is my belief that, before the Seventies have passed, priority will be given to 16 years of public education, including two years of preschool and two years of post-high school education.

The expense will be considerable. But not as great as the expense of not supplying the added education necessitated by the greatly increased burdens being placed on man's shoulders in this age. Children as young as three can and should be taught elementary learning skills. Disadvantaged children who are taught virtually nothing until they are six have lost the race with life by the time they are ten.

It is on these critical early-age periods of human life that the survival of this race rests, not on late-hour racial laws, patchwork punishment procedures, finger-in-the-dike relief programs, and mass-media "love thy neighbor" jingles. We will get the world of freedom, of law and order, of love, if we plant the seeds of purpose, tend the garden with diligence, and are realistic.

In education, as in so many fields, we have allowed our problems to pile up on us. We have delayed planning until the crisis becomes a collision course. There is no longer any doubt about the extensive rethinking, reshaping, and replanning that must be done in our schools. The only question is: Who will do the planning?

As Florida Congressman Robert Graham said in one of the occasional papers for the Education Commission of the States: "Some higher education administrators have despaired because my political colleagues have not treated rational state higher education planning with great receptivity in recent months. I can offer as solace the fact that a basic element of the politician's personality is the desire to avoid decisions."

But there are many decisions now past due. And we'll have to reach some kind of coordinated planning structure for uncovering these problems, diagnosing them, and prescribing cures. For half a century, state influence on the significant social, economic, and political issues has waned. This was happening while a coalition was forming between the federal government, large cities, and the farmer.

For years, the states' excuse for this has been malapportionment. Failure to represent the people rendered states impotent to contemporary problems. Now in all states the impact of reapportionment has eliminated the excuse. We will soon see, as Representative Graham has said, if the states' 80 years of failure have been cosmetic or congenital.

Responsiveness of the states is only a step in what must ultimately be a major reform in the structure of our school system, but it is a vital and basic step—and it must be made now. It is a keystone in the future development of the United States.

We owe it to the cause of logic. We owe it to our peace of mind. We owe it to fiscal responsibility. We owe it to the ethos which has given our nation its very special personality and imprint. But, most of all, we owe it to the children and to their future.

There is no intellectually honest way to downgrade the importance of our educational

E 6090

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

July 1, 1970

system. Education gives us the principal processes of character formation. Education makes possible the mass knowledge that empowers a democratic society to weigh issues and to make decisions about them. Education gives the selective skills and mental dexterity by which democratic action is possible. It is, in fact, the dynamo of democracy.

STRATEGIC FAILURE

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as our troops begin to come out of Cambodia and the President prepares to go before the country with his tote board of captured guns, bicycles, and rice to celebrate a tactical triumph, it is important to face the fact that, whatever it is tactically speaking, it is only another instance of strategic failure.

Even considered tactically, there are serious doubts about an operation that as of yesterday had cost 339 American and 860 South Vietnamese lives, and 1,501 American and 3,603 South Vietnamese wounded. And who knows how many of the 11,000 bodies counted as "enemy" were Cambodian peasants caught in the indiscriminate swath of war?

However one tallies the costs and benefits in a tactical sense, strategically we face a wider war, fraught with new complexities, uncertainties, and risks.

The Lon Nol government, our new and costly Cambodian client, is floundering, and we can be sure who it will grab if it starts to go under. According to a report in the June 29 edition of the New York Times, the Cambodian Army presently holds less than one-third of the country's 69,000 square miles, while the North Vietnamese and anti-government Cambodians firmly control one-third of the country and can roam at will through the remaining third.

Our Cambodian venture has had the effect of welding Communist elements throughout Indochina closer together and, worse, closer to China.

At a deeper level, the venture is a failure because it has provided another occasion for indulging in self-deception, for refusing to face the facts upon which sound strategy is based.

Prof. James C. Thompson of Harvard, who served on the staff of the National Security Council and in the State Department in the last administration, expresses this aspect of the failure especially well in a lecture he gave to a recent meeting of the Yale-in-China Association:

Every effort to avert acceptance of error and failure—every "cosmetic" approach, in current Washington parlance—is simply a formula for further evasion and self-deception and for a longer, wider war. Every effort to "save face" will lead to a new Cambodia. For any President who thinks he can now exit with grace from this twenty-year error is a President who, when confronted with the possibility of the look of defeat, will balk and grope for a new Cambodia—new flexing of the muscles, new acts of bravado, new

targets of opportunity, new military adventures, up to and including, I deeply fear, the threat of the use of nuclear weapons and, if need be, the actual use of nuclear weapons. For there will always be persuasive peddlers of new ways to win this unwinnable war.

What we so desperately need out of our present President, or his successor, is something no President has yet had the courage to face and to tell the American people: that Vietnam was "lost" to Vietnamese nationalism many years ago by the French, by Americans, and mostly by Vietnamese; that nothing short of world war might "retrieve" that loss; that the loss doesn't matter in terms of American security interests, and indeed has never mattered; and that an admission of error and failure that brings peace to a shattered region is, far from "national humiliation," the first step toward national regeneration, an act of true national courage.

I am inserting in the RECORD a related article by Professor Thompson that appeared in the London Times and a piece by Orville Scheel, codirector of the Bay Area Institute, from the New Republic. Both articles ably define the dimensions of the strategic failure:

[From London Sunday Times, May 10, 1970]

BLIND GAMBLE IN INDOCHINA

(By James C. Thomson, Jr.)

Mr. Nixon's Cambodian lunge has opened another grim chapter in the long and baffling story of the American-East Asian relationship—one from which neither America nor East Asia will emerge quite the same as before.

For more than a century Americans have been obsessed with the Far East, an obsession rooted in concepts of mission and manifest destiny. Since the turn of this century the obsession has been transformed into policy: a presumption of national interests in the region, a grand style of rhetoric to cover those interests, occasional resorts to war to protect them, but throughout a curious and persistent inability to define them.

Policies and actions have often been out of line, often a result of internal confusion in Washington. On Vietnam, for instance, what kind of war was it, and who was the real enemy? Was it a civil war or international aggression? And if the latter, was the "real enemy" Hanoi? Peking? Moscow? International Communism? Or maybe "Asian Communism"?

It is sadly appropriate that the obsession, the policy, and the confusion should find their most recent expression in the systematic obliteration of a Cambodian town called Snoul, while Mr. Nixon tells his people that such things are done to avoid "national humiliation." A while ago, before My Lai, Mr. Nixon's predecessor stressed the centrality of his country's "national honour."

How is one to explain this ongoing American tragedy which yet another President has now compounded?

At the heart of the matter was and is China. Some say that China became to America what India was to Britain, but much more so and with a different outcome. Out of a century of apparently altruistic involvement—efforts at evangelism, education, technical assistance—as well as trade and investment, Americans developed a powerful self-image of their nation's special benevolence toward China and of China's special responsiveness.

But the fury of the Chinese revolution—Chinese Nationalism and, in time, the victory of its Communist wing—assaulted the foundations of that self-image. And the American response, in the world-wide Cold War climate after 1949, was to suspect betrayal at home and abroad. Clearly the new China was a creation of Moscow and its agent ("a Slavic Manchukuo," said Mr.

Dean Rusk in 1951) and a dangerously expansionist Power. The true China remained among the exiles on Formosa; the false China must be contained and isolated.

Hence the construction of a network of alliances and bases to defend "Free Asia." Hence new efforts at the export of benevolence, the creation of anti-Communist States in America's own image. Hence, specifically, America's funding of France's struggle for military victory and/or "Vietnamisation" in Indo-China (assistance initially provided, as Mr. Acheson has recently revealed, in order to get France to do what Washington wanted done in Europe). In the process, of course, the very separate roots and identity of the Vietnamese revolution were lost on the policy-makers; equally lost was any clear perception of the fusion of Nationalism and Communism—a potent mix—that fed that revolution.

China, then, is central to America's Asian involvement. But China is not the only factor—and, indeed, has been a receding factor in the past ten years, thanks largely to Peking's military caution and internal preoccupations as well as Sino-Soviet enmity.

Two decades of containment of China's Golden Horde have bred strong habits of thought among those who make policy in Washington. There is, first of all, the well-known domino theory, enunciated originally by General Eisenhower but soon firmly lodged in the American view of Asia. The idea that if you knock over one Asian state, they all fall down, has the virtue of simplicity.

Its premise that all Asian states act alike may well stem from the traditional Western conviction that all Asians "look alike." As for policy-makers, domino-ism makes quite unnecessary any careful appraisal of the critically important differences that distinguish Thais from Cambodians, Burmese from Koreans, Indonesians from Japanese—or, most important of all, Vietnamese from Chinese, age-old foes. All that is needed is a map and an ink-brush to show the alarming consequences of one small nation's collapse.

In very recent years Washington's statesmen have begun to de-emphasize domino-ism, perhaps out of belated experience of Asia's resilient nationalism, perhaps to avoid a self-fulfilling prophecy. Yet in one fundamental respect the concept retains its hold: a fear, from the theory's earliest days, that the final domino (and perhaps the only one) is the Administration in power. That the "loss" of a foreign State to Communism means your party's loss at the polls is the most potent legacy of the "loss" of China in 1949 and the defeat of the Democrats in 1952.

Yet another habit of thought pertains to America's military ascendancy and its relation to Asian issues. From Commodore Perry to Theodore Roosevelt and Henry L. Stimson, American statesmen had believed that if you stood up to Asians, they would soon back down. To traditions of firmness and character the post-war years have added unsurpassed power. Little wonder the Stimsonian itch to deal firmly with Asians has its latter-day expression in President Johnson's decision to bomb the Vietnamese into negotiations and President Nixon's assertion, as he invades Cambodia, that Vietnam is a test of America's "will." What is missing is any sense that Asians, too, have will—and that one's will is usually strongest on one's own home ground.

Such habits are compounded by sheer ignorance of Asian realities; of age-old hostility, for instance, among Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Thais, and between all three and Chinese; of the fact that Laos is a non-country created by France, that Cambodia is the Poland of South-East Asia caught and carved between Thailand and Vietnam, and that French and American intervention has only postponed for a while the probable di-

July 1, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 6091

vision of the Indo-China region between Thailand and Vietnam.

They are also compounded by patterns of official prose: by a persistent tendency towards rhetorical escalation—an ever more shrill definition of the importance of the stakes, as the price and doubts soar, to cover the paucity of stakes. Vietnam becomes important quite simply because Administrations have said it was important.

And they are further compounded, of course, by American pride: by presidential unwillingness to admit a colossal national blunder that spans two decades and five Administrations, and by presidential susceptibility to "solutions" that will somehow make the outcome look like less than failure.

So this month Mr. Nixon, captive of familiar pressures, gives in to the Cambodian "solution" long urged by Saigon and the Pentagon. It is a sad move for one who recently seemed as if he really wanted "out." A gamble, it is called by many commentators, here and in Washington—even a courageous gamble. More properly, a desperate evasion: an evasion of the central facts that no President has had the courage to face and to tell to his people—that Vietnam was "lost" to Vietnamese national-communism many years ago, by French, Americans, and Vietnamese; that nothing short of world war could retrieve that loss; that the loss doesn't matter in terms of American national interest; and that an admission of error that brings peace to a shattered region is, far from "national humiliation," the first step toward national regeneration, an act of true courage.

CAMBODIAN CIVIL WAR

(By Orville Schell)

We now see that the Cambodian invasion, far from being a "brief surgical operation" quickly performed and done with, has opened wide a new and dangerous fissure. Tad Szulc in *The New York Times* of May 20 reports "senior officials" in Washington as believing that "in some ways the situation in Cambodia was beginning to resemble South Vietnam in 1960 when the Vietcong began their rebellion against the Saigon regime." George McT. Kahin, director of the Southeast Asia program at Cornell, puts it more bluntly: "President Nixon has contributed to the creation of a formidable anti-American alliance in Cambodia, making a long civil war in that country inevitable."

Until the coup in March, the Cambodian body politic existed in a precarious balance with Prince Sihanouk in the middle. To his right stood the former (and present) Premier and Minister of National Defense, General Lon Nol. He was chief of the 35,000-man Cambodian Army which was largely trained and partially equipped under US military aid amounting to some \$94 million up to 1964, when Sihanouk requested that it be stopped. Although Lon Nol made trips to both Peking and Hanoi for Sihanouk, he was known for his "anti-Communist" and "pro-Western" feelings. He reportedly traveled to the Communist capitals in attempts to persuade Hanoi and Peking that the NLF and the North Vietnamese Army (NVA) should leave their Cambodian base camps. Although he did not always agree with Sihanouk, Lon Nol was included in various cabinets as a balance against the left. Sihanouk used him as a kind of warning to the Cambodian Communists not to push too hard against his own, middle-of-the-road, poorly organized Sangkum Party, which he formed hastily when he abdicated the throne in 1955.

To Sihanouk's left were the Khmer Rouge, whom he played down as much as possible, and of whom the American press has chosen to take almost no notice. The Khmer Rouge (or Red Khmers) have not been a strong force numerically in past years, but they served to point up the fact that Cambodia, although not at war, had by no means remedied the plight of the peasant or of rural

government. Their numerous, but usually inconsequential, attacks on government troops were an annoyance, but less important (although the Sihanouk government claimed to have killed some 300) than the de facto control they exercised in parts of the rural hinterland, particularly around the vital ports of Sihanoukville and Kep on the southern part of the Cambodian-Vietnamese border. The NLF has been getting supplies to its troops in the Mekong Delta region in South Vietnam through these ports. Apparently Sihanouk was unwilling to move into this area and clean up the NLF operations, because it would have risked a major clash with indigenous Cambodian forces. Lon Nol did not share these apprehensions and always favored a hard line against both NLF and Khmer Rouge activities.

The Khmer Rouge, who now operate in some five different districts in Cambodia, were formed of remnants of the old Cambodian Vietminh (never very strong due to the rather pro-French stance of Sihanouk), disaffected teachers and student intellectuals, former elected officials and a peasant following of undetermined size. Estimates, until recent weeks, placed the total number of Khmer Rouge at around 3000. From leaflets left in villages through which they have moved, it is known that they want to "liberate Cambodia from the Americans," that they are scornful of religion (Buddhism), critical of police and army extortion of the peasantry, and corrupt government monopolies. Various factions of the Khmer Rouge have been so isolated from one another that they have not had any unified program. Their two main bases adjacent to Tay Ninh Province, in Svay Rieng and Prey Veng, have been closely allied with the NLF. These Khmer Rouge have harassed not only Cambodian government officials, but have joined the NLF in sorties into South Vietnam.

But there are other Khmer Rouge to the west of Phnom Penh who have been more independent. Their base camps stretch from the Thai border down along the Elephant Range to the coastal ports at Kampot. They are led by Hou Youn, who is described by U.S. intelligence sources in the *Far Eastern Economic Review* as a "man of truly astounding intellectual and physical strength." Hou Youn is an ex-National Assemblyman who was expelled from Phnom Penh during Lon Nol's crackdown on Communist activities in 1967. Demonstrations followed Lon Nol's severe treatment of peasant rebels in Battambang Province, who were said to be led by Hou Youn and the Khmer Rouge. As a result of Lon Nol became the *bête noire* of Cambodian leftists, who have since branded him as "an American stooge."

Interestingly, neither wing of the Khmer Rouge ever criticized Sihanouk by name, which does not mean that Sihanouk did not oppose their activities. Thus, in June of last year he commented that "the Vietcong fight a foreign imperialism in order to liberate their country in order to give it independence. They are furthermore supported by the South Vietnamese people while receiving no instructions from foreign organizations, whereas the Khmer Reds fight their country's government which is known by the whole world to be the guardian of national independence and nonalignment and to derive its power from the people through general elections. The Khmer Reds kill their own compatriots and are in the pay of either Maoism or the Vietminh." In an interview in February, 1969, Sihanouk said: "Leaflets scattered around by night announce the formation of self-styled clandestine Communist 'parties' or 'movements.' We do not know how many members they have, but very few in any case. I do not think that China 'controls' these grouplets, although Chinese activists in Cambodia give them assistance."

Officially, China had been chary about

giving any support of an official nature to the Khmer Rouge. In past years there has been no mention of their activities in the *People's Daily*. The Chinese chose rather to support Sihanouk, even extending him a rather generous aid program.

In a sense, then, Sihanouk was the fulcrum point between the contending leftist and rightist, or pro-Western and Pro-Communist forces. With Lon Nol's coup and the US invasion of Cambodia, all that changed. Cambodia is polarized: Lon Nol and the Army (with American aid) on the right, and the Khmer Rouge (with Hanoi and NLF aid) on the left. Cambodia has become an annex of Vietnam both politically and militarily. Sihanouk has been forced to join friends where he finds them. And from exile in Peking, his alternatives are few. He has turned to the Khmer Rouge, his erstwhile enemies. Their movement, which has been small and almost unrecognized on the international scene, now has a leader of stature, the only man who has the prestige to rally the Cambodian peasants behind any mass movement. The Khmer Rouge has been rejuvenated.

On April 17, *Le Monde* reported in a headline that in Svay Rieng, already "peasants appear to be joining the ranks of the local Communist guerrillas." The article by Jean-Claude Pomonti goes on to describe the newly formed Khmer Rouge provisional government and how the war is forcing peasants into the expanding ranks of the Khmer Rouge Army in the area. He writes: "Three former deputies of the Cambodian National Assembly, Messrs. Khieu Sam Phon, Hou Youn and Hu Nim, who rejoined the underground several years ago and are considered the leaders of the Khmer Rouge, published last March 26 a declaration of support for Prince Sihanouk." The three ex-deputies urge "all our compatriots, in the city as well as the countryside, not to enter into the army or into the police to serve as cannon fodder for the American Imperialists and for the traitors to the fatherland, Lon Nol and Sirik Matak, to not pay them taxes, to not respect their savage laws, and to sincerely and resolutely unite in the National Unified Front of Kampuchea [Cambodia], to organize guerrilla forces of the Khmer people who are ready to receive you now."

On April 21, in *Le Monde*, Jacques Decrocy reported that "a National Liberation Front of Kampuchea [that is, of Cambodia] has just been created. It already operates in certain 'liberated territories' and claims to carry out operations thanks to its 'liberator the Khmer Army.'" A correspondent for *Agence France Presse* quotes a cadre of the Front as saying that they had already "totally liberated" the province of Rattanakiri and that, "The following year, perhaps sooner, we will be at Phnom Penh. But the Prince will return before that time." The correspondent reported that the "Khmer Liberation Army has vehicles and automatic machine guns taken from the Government Army." The Khmer Rouge, with the help of the NLF, seem uninterested at this point in capturing towns and cities (which will only be razed by US air strikes and armor). They are reportedly determined to create "liberated zones" *a la* Mao, from which they can put a guerrilla army of their own in the field.

Peking has taken careful note of all this. Headlines in the *People's Daily* now trumpet support for Sihanouk's government-in-exile (which includes such Khmer Rouge leaders as Hou Youn as Minister of the Interior and Peasant Problems) and for the Summit Conference of the Indochinese Peoples which was attended by Chou En-lai, Sihanouk, Nguyen Huu Tho (NLF), Pham Van Dong (DRV) and Prince Souvanouvong (Pathet Lao).

On May 4, the *New China News Service* reported Chou as saying: "Armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought and tempered through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution,

E 6092

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

July 1, 1970

the Chinese people, will always give all-out support and assistance to the fraternal peoples of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam in carrying to the end the war against US aggression and for national salvation."

The day before at the Summit conference, Chou said that "the 700 million Chinese people provide a powerful backing for the three Indochinese peoples and the vast expanse of China's territory is their reliable 'rear area' [hou-fang]." "Rear area" is not a term the Chinese have traditionally used with abandon, inasmuch as it has the connotation of the word "sanctuary." Now it appears that they have decided to stake their prestige and support on Sihanouk. One can hardly believe that they would have given such unqualified support (after initially being so cool) did they not think that Sihanouk was capable of pulling a movement together back home.

It is increasingly probable that US-supplied South Vietnamese forces will remain in Cambodia indefinitely, for "the Lon Nol regime will need assistance," as Mr. Szulc notes in the *Times*, to deal with guerrilla and subversive activities." That raises the question whether US commanders will not at some point be directing ground operations, but more probably air strikes, against Khmer Rouge sanctuaries" (as well as those of the NVA and NLF) in a prolonged Cambodian civil war.

BABE RUTH BASEBALL

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, due to a prior commitment I was unable to attend the breakfast held recently on Capitol Hill in the interest of Babe Ruth baseball.

I am sorry that I missed this affair as I did want to renew my long friendship with one of the greatest players in the history of major league baseball—Vernon "Lefty" Gomez, who served as toastmaster and performed in his usually humorous and highly entertaining style.

We in northeastern Pennsylvania remember Lefty for his scintillating record as a pitcher for the great New York Yankees and we also remember him for the years he managed the Yankee farm team at Binghamton, N.Y., which was in the same league as my hometown team, the Wilkes-Barre Barons. So, we got to see Lefty quite often during those years and we hold him in great affection.

I understand Lefty had some nice things to say about Wilkes-Barre during the course of the recent Capitol Hill breakfast program, and for that I thank him very much.

Baseball is a great game and needs the support of many of us. I strongly support all programs in athletics for our young people and I particularly support Babe Ruth baseball, which is a truly outstanding program to develop the major league players of tomorrow. It is named in honor of the greatest player in the history of baseball and I am sure the Babe would not want to be remembered in a finer way.

So, I extend my congratulations to Mrs. Babe Ruth, Lefty Gomez, Bowie Kuhn, and the many others who are actively engaged in the promotion and further development of Babe Ruth baseball. They are performing a fine service to the youth of our country.

MINNESOTA LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS URGES REPEAL OF THE INDIAN TERMINATION RESOLUTION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker the League of Women Voters in Minnesota has done an outstanding job of focusing attention on the needs and concerns of our State's 35,000 American Indians. "Indians in Minneapolis," a study prepared by the Minneapolis chapter, has been acclaimed nationally as the most comprehensive analysis to date of urban Indian conditions.

Currently, the Minnesota league is supporting legislation introduced by myself and 28 colleagues to repeal House Concurrent Resolution 108, the 1953 Indian "termination" resolution.

The following correspondence from Mrs. O. J. Janski, State president of the Minnesota LWV, provides an excellent statement of the need to repeal this congressional action opposed so bitterly by Indian groups throughout the country.

The correspondence follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA.

St. Paul, Minn., June 24, 1970.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: Thank you for taking the lead to repeal House Concurrent Resolution 108. The enclosed letter is being sent to all Minnesota Congressmen.

Sincerely,

MRS. O. J. JANSKI,
State President.

JUNE 24, 1970.

HON. CLARK MACGREGOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACGREGOR: The League of Women Voters of Minnesota was pleased to see that a bipartisan effort will be made to repeal House Concurrent Resolution 108. This states that it is federal policy to ultimately terminate Indian reservations. Although this policy has not been pushed in recent years, it still is on record as being the government's objective in dealing with Indian citizens.

We refer to this resolution, passed in 1953, because its wording was inaccurate to begin with and when it was enforced, the results were disastrous. It states:

"Whereas it is the policy of Congress, as rapidly as possible, to make the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States subject to the same laws and entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens of the United States, to end their status as wards of the United States, and to grant them all of the rights and prerogatives pertaining to American citizenship; and

"Whereas the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States should assume their full responsibilities as American citizens: Now therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is declared to be the sense of Congress that, at the earliest possible time . . . (tribes in 4 states and 5 named tribes) . . . should be freed from Federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians . . ."

The resolution is cast in terms of granting Indians the rights and privileges of citizens. Indians are already American citizens and

they already are "entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens." (Military service, paying taxes, etc.) Also they are not in any sense "wards of the United States. The government does not control the individual Indian. The relationship is based on treaties between nations.

The federal government now holds reservation land in trust status on behalf of the Indians because of these treaties. Other services follow because of the tax exempt status of the land and the nation's desire to assist this minority.

In 1962, in our League's study "Indians in Minnesota" we pointed out that "The resolution is not so important for what it would give Indians as for what it would remove from them." And this is what has happened as the sad stories of the Menominee and Klamath tribes attest.

Indians throughout the nation, no matter what their circumstances, fear this resolution. It has never been rejected by Congress and could at any time be used to threaten their limited remaining lands and their very existence.

We urge you to join in the action to rescind House Concurrent Resolution 108.

Sincerely,

MRS. O. J. JANSKI,
State President.

CONGRESSMAN PATTEN'S YEARLY QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, each year I send a legislative questionnaire to every home in the congressional district I represent.

The response has always been gratifying—not only in the number of persons who take part, but in the deep interest and strong enthusiasm they display in expressing their views.

This year's questionnaire consists of 10 questions—six on domestic issues and four on foreign affairs.

The questions are:

Please list what you consider to be the three most serious domestic problems facing the Nation.

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said that wage and price controls may be necessary because of inflation. Would you favor such controls on a temporary basis?

Should Federal spending be increased to fight air and water pollution?

Do you favor changing the present lottery system for military service to an all-volunteer army?

Do you believe the Nation's space program should be expanded, cut back, or be continued at the present rate?

Do you support legislation that would establish Federal health and safety standards for workers?

On the Vietnam war, which one of these alternatives do you favor?

First. President Nixon's present Vietnamization policy—a phased withdrawal of U.S. combat troops to be replaced by South Vietnamese troops.

Second. Disengagement at a faster pace than the President is pursuing.

Third. Increasing the U.S. military effort.

July 1, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 6317

standards to insure the reliability and comparability of marine data.

The Economic Development Administration also can contribute to the development of marine industry through its efforts to bring new economic opportunity to geographic areas with idle and underused work forces.

What this means is that, in addition to the organizations and people specifically dedicated to the operation of NOAA, there will be available a rich resource of survey, analytical, marketing, finance, taxation, export, and state-coordination talent.

If I appear to dwell upon the Department's role in the new effort, it is because I am most intimately familiar with it. But let me point out that in the Federal establishment, no agency is an island. In all things, and particularly in the environment, many agencies make direct and indirect contributions to the effort. So it will be in this one: we want and need the assistance of our sister agencies, and we shall work with them in a spirit of willing cooperation to get the results the Nation needs.

Thus far I have spoken to government's responsibilities in the marine area. It is an area in which the participation of science and technology, the universities, and industry outside of government are vital. The health and growth of the entire Nation are dependent to a large degree upon the scientific and technological capabilities which reside in the marine area.

Further, we are convinced that the whole area of marine technology needs development by industry, with the assistance of government. Our search for a unified philosophy of ocean management in the larger environmental context is in fact a search for the road to economic growth, and it is one in which industry must be a full partner.

We intend to ask for the creation of a distinguished national advisory committee to work directly with the Secretary of Commerce. In assembling that group, we shall draw upon the talents of the Nation's top leaders in marine affairs.

For if one fact emerges clearly in this maze of watery complexities, it is this: every advance in oceanic affairs will be made possible or enhanced by the contributions of marine technology, and in many cases of industrially-based marine technology.

Fundamental technology relevant to marine minerals exploration and recovery must be forthcoming. Survey equipment must be developed and ocean vessels fully equipped with the most advanced sensor and data processing systems. If we are ever to have power systems for undersea operations and resource development, if aquaculture is to take on new meaning, if fish protein concentrate is to become a staple instead of a proposal, if our anadromous and Great Lakes fishes are to be preserved and multiplied, if global environmental monitoring is to become a reality—

Marine technology will have been there first.

We are entering a time when man must make the most of his environment—every part of it. When Americans understand the nature of a problem, they have a way of solving it, no matter how close to insolvency it may appear. And this is how it will be with the problems we have been thinking about here.

Let us get on with it—together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BETTERING CONDITIONS AT BARGAINING TABLE BETWEEN LABOR AND INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the time to read into the RECORD a letter from Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, as well as the text of his address to the Personnel Administration Association of Baltimore.

I do this to show that there are within the labor fraternity men who are giving a great deal of time and energy to bettering conditions at the bargaining table between labor and industry:

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DENT: The current and recurring collective bargaining controversies are generating a considerable amount of popular attention now, but for many in Congress and for those of us who live in the world of collective bargaining, attention to this issue is a 365-days a year proposition.

We try to find ways to improve collective bargaining, and to make it work better for all who are concerned and all who are affected.

I would like to submit a suggestion along those lines to you.

It is obvious to me from my experience that personnel people, the corporation officials in charge of obtaining and retaining employees, do not have the influence they should have in management. They do not seem to be an influence in management decisions on corporate and on public policy which relate directly to their assignment.

For instance, many personnel people are hiring inner city residents who have not been given the education they need to perform adequately on the job. But when Congress proposes aid to schools in deprived areas, management associations lobby against it. Meanwhile management has to institute its own costly remedial education programs to train the employee in elementary school and high school skills. So management associations are, in effect, lobbying against management's real interests.

I made this the topic of the enclosed speech to the Personnel Administration Association of Baltimore, several weeks ago and since you have an interest in collective bargaining as well as an interest in influences on the legislative process, I submit it for your perusal.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. BEIRNE,
President.

VITAL ISSUES

(Text of address by Joseph A. Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, to the members of the Personnel Administration of Baltimore, March 18, 1970)

I appreciate your invitation to speak here tonight. It has a special appeal to me because we are both in professions which focus on personnel.

You look at it as management officials. I look at it as the President of a labor union.

So, perhaps our orientations are different. But as we explore this for the next 20 minutes or so, I think we can develop this relationship between your work and mine—between organized labor and personnel management.

I would like to go beyond the aspect which we are all familiar with . . . the day-to-day

involvement and the contract expiration to new contract involvement.

There is another very significant dimension to our work which is barely ever recognized and hardly ever utilized.

It is undercover, dormant.

But it has in it the seeds of great and positive achievement which can mutually benefit not just you as management . . . not just me as a Union President . . . but everyone.

That undercover and dormant relationship is our mutual need—your need and my need—to be stronger influences . . . more dominant influences . . . in the decisions of top management.

I cannot believe that personnel people . . . who have the responsibility of obtaining and retaining an adequate work force . . . are given the voice you should have in forming management's public and corporate policies.

For more than 25 years, I have been President of the Communications Workers of America, and during those years—just as I have successively been re-elected President—I have dealt with successive managements of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and other companies.

Our contracts attest to the Communications Workers' ability to influence management so far as good wages and working conditions and job security are concerned.

I would not be standing before you as President of a Union which represents more than a half-million workers if that were not so.

But when I look at the public policies of American management . . . especially in the harsh light of the problems that face us all in the 1970s, I see much room for improvement.

This is where our relationship can and should go to work.

This is where our problems are mutual, and where our benefits would be mutual.

We are all consumers. Management families and worker families eat meat bought at the same markets. Both want the same thing—a clean, pure product. In 1967 organized labor worked in Congress for a strong consumer law on meat.

The organizations that speak for management did not.

Management children and workers' children ride school buses—very often the same school buses. Last month—after intensive publicity on brake and clutch failure—General Motors recalled thousands of faulty buses for repairs.

Organized labor fought for strong laws on automotive safety.

The organizations that speak for management did not.

The irony in this lack of linkage between true corporate needs and corporate public policy is a national tragedy.

Management must be made to perceive it. There is a way to bring it home.

You who are responsible for personnel have the opportunity to do it.

Quite often you see coming into your offices the young men and young women of the ghetto who are looking for jobs.

You see the high school graduates with fifth grade reading ability.

But you are looking for young people who can comprehend detailed written procedure manuals.

You see people from a deprived culture which did not include practicing normal work habits—such things as getting to work on time five days a week, eating meals at a regular time, all of the attitudes and mores previous generations of personnel managers took for granted.

But you still must provide an adequate work force for your employer.

This became a recognized national problem in the 1960s, but for many years before then organized labor saw that education was un-

H 6318

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

July 1, 1970

derfinanced in this nation, and organized labor fought for federal aid to education.

It took the Russians' Sputnik—the first space vehicle, to get movement started in aid to education.

And it took until 1965 to get federal aid to elementary and high schools.

Organizations which speak for management on Capitol Hill oppose it, and still today they fight to cut its appropriations every time money is sought.

President Nixon vetoed the HEW appropriation bill this year because he said it had too much money—\$1.3 billion—and not all for education—in it.

That \$1.3 billion was supposed to be inflationary, but \$1.3 billion is about one half of one percent of the federal budget. It is about one-tenth of one percent of a trillion-dollar Gross National Product.

And it is just a drop in the very large bucket of what our schools need so that they can turn out the graduates you need.

Chase Manhattan Bank, the biggest bank in New York, has been forced to confront this problem. In 1963 eight percent of its employees were inner city residents—ghetto resident. In 1970 the figure was 30 percent.

With this increase came associated situations such as charges of bias on the part of white supervisors against the new employees. Chase investigated. It found that there was bias . . . that some supervisors were putting their personal feelings ahead of doing what they were being paid to do—supervise fairly and impartially.

Chase has had to develop a program to correct this attitude among supervisors.

But with a turnover rate of about 70 percent in starting level jobs, Chase will continue to have the problem of the ghetto graduate . . . the graduate who must look to a supervisor to train him and condition him to be a successful worker.

The corporations are having to do what the school and the neighborhood failed to do. They are beginning to realize the dimensions of the job they face.

Chase's vice president in charge of training, Henry Coburn, discussed this in the Wall Street Journal . . . and these are Coburn's words . . . "I'll never understand why the hell everybody in New York isn't screaming bloody murder."

Screaming bloody murder to whom?

To the Chamber of Commerce of the United States . . . and the National Association of Manufacturers . . . and the American Bankers Association . . . for opposing programs which would at least do a little to improve education?

Aren't these organizations working at cross-purposes with you?

Management has the problem of having to hire employees whose education and background do not prepare them for effective work. A program is developed to improve neighborhoods and improve schools. Management's spokesmen fight the program.

Isn't that self-defeating?

So I ask you to point out this gap between management attitude and management opportunity when your responsibility for personnel is being discussed.

You face the problem . . . you are most competent to ask management to turn around and look at this from a new perspective.

You see its rate of acceleration more accurately than others.

The speed of change, brought about by the computer and instant communications, is not really recognized yet. It is tomorrow before we can see what happened to us today. It is the day after tomorrow before we can find out why it happened. And by the time we develop a program to do something about it, it may be too late.

Unless management gets moving.

In telephone communications we have

worked out a program called the "buddy system" in some places, and under other names elsewhere, to do something about hard core unemployment. This was done in conjunction with the Bell companies. It is movement in the right direction.

The Bell System could make many more moves in areas which affect its employees . . . both as workers and as fellow citizens . . . It has not

Its ability to manage is deteriorating rapidly. I get no pleasure in telling you that, but it is a fact.

It has pluperfect public relations programs for public issues, but I see no signs of its Capitol Hill spokesmen working for anything progressive.

My union has called for enactment of a principle which states that every American is entitled, as a matter of right, to all of the education he can successfully utilize, from pre-elementary through graduate school with desire to learn and ability to absorb as the only two criteria.

We would welcome support for this from the associations which represent management before Congress.

My Union has also called upon its almost 900 locals to participate in the nonpartisan teach-ins on environment which will take place on campuses across the nation this April 22.

We will take part in their organization, planning their direction, and in post-teach-in follow-throughs designed to achieve results.

I hope management will give sincere support to the environmental teach-ins.

The problems of pollution for management have gone far beyond what public relations departments can handle through devious proclamations puffing up what essentially are hollow programs.

It is too late for that.

Our earth is plainly in peril . . . we face a catastrophe.

An instant cease fire can stop a shooting war while negotiations take place, but there is no way to stop a pollution war while a clean-up takes place.

Sewage and garbage, like taxes and death, do not stop.

So today's technology, which took men to the moon . . . and let us communicate with them both visually and audibly . . . must develop the methods to eradicate pollution.

Will management's cost experts establish attitudes on this, or will its human experts establish the attitudes?

If management looks at this from the point of view of how much it can get by with, and how little of the expense it can pay, you will have a situation similar to the one you have with employment.

You will have another people problem.

You will have men and women working to produce products, knowing at the same time they are polluting their air and water, and their children's air and water.

Nobody can live that way for very long.

Management must make the little turn it takes to sincerely see the problems which we face mutually and collectively. If it does . . . if the human oriented people in management prevail over those who see things only in the terms of sterile costs and PR puffery—we will have made a true move in this country.

Historically, Americans have been able to do that.

When great crises arose in the past, we became pluralists . . . we saw the other side of the story. We understood what the other side was trying to say, and enough of us agreed on a solution to make it work.

I think we are inching toward something like that now.

I do not think we are approaching it fast enough.

Our American system has always seemed to me not to be forged out of steel, but a

fabric woven from many threads. Some of it is weak; some of it is beautiful embroidery; some of it is unbreakable.

Here and there, under pressure and strain, the fabric wears thin and unravels. So those of us who can, and who want to, try to re-weave the damaged places, and make them stronger than before.

For almost 200 years we have been able to repair the fabric and keep it together because when we had to, we got to the basic cause of a problem, and we treated it. We forgot about the symptoms and started working on the disease.

Our country today has some dangerously thin spots.

The economy is in a treacherous early recession, but prices are still going up. Our cities are not able to provide the amenities residents need. Our medical discoveries are superb but we deliver health care through a horse and buggy system. In 85 years, our air and water may be unusable.

It is late, but we are recognizing what we face.

We are looking at basic causes more, and outward symptoms less.

We are becoming solution oriented.

So I am not giving up. I have been fighting too long to give up now.

I hope that your profession is not giving up.

I hope that it is moving toward taking a new view, from a new perspective, at these situations we have discussed.

You have the right to ask if your management really understands these dilemmas. You have a right to ask if the associations which speak for your industry are saying the kinds of things that will help you.

That is what I as a union official, have been doing.

So, in summary, we have talked about our mutual need to be stronger influences in management's corporate and public policy.

We have looked at some areas of collective interest—education, environment, consumer legislation. We have noted the ironic and tragic disparity between management's true goals and the self-defeating actions of management toward achieving those goals.

And we have suggested that management scrutinize its attitudes toward these situations, see them from a new perspective, and close its opportunity gap.

My experience, and the history of this nation, both say it will work.

It has since the days of antiquity, when a poet urged others to take on a necessary but hard task by telling them . . . "you can, because you think you can."

SOUTHEAST ASIA: THE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has withdrawn all U.S. ground forces from Cambodia. But our Air Force continues its strikes there and the future of that country remains in doubt, as does the future of all Southeast Asia. The military tactical maneuver is over, but the murky political questions both present and future remain with us still. Questions that have long been asked remain without answers.

The chief question is what is our goal in Southeast Asia? What is it we seek, and why?

President Johnson stated the case in terms of an American commitment to freedom in Asia, which would be a commitment as real as our commitment to the defense of freedom in Europe. Presi-

July 1, 1970

dent Nixon states that our policy is simply to assure free choice; he seems to say that any government in any country is all right, so long as that government obtains power by more or less legitimate means. There is not much difference between these statements of policy, at least not much difference that can readily be seen.

The problem is that in fact our goal in Southeast Asia is not clear. Are we out to defeat aggression, or are we not? And why is Southeast Asia of concern to us? If Vietnam is vital, then why is not Cambodia equally vital to our interests? If our military commitment is lesser today than it was yesterday, why is it that our Air Force has greater combat assignments now than it did a month or so ago?

Americans are not ashamed to commit themselves to the cause of freedom, or to the defense of another land; history shows that indeed we welcome such a challenge, when it becomes necessary. There can be no question of the determination and courage of our people, if they are given a cause that they can truly believe in. But as a free people, Americans demand, and have a right to know, what objective it is that they fight for, and why.

Answers are required, answers that have not been given either by Congress or by the President.

These are matters that cannot be settled in the easy exchange of simple slogans, or in partisan charge and counter-charge. The election of 1968 is past, and it is time that the politicians of that contest cease politicking and assume statesmanship. The decisions that must be taken now and the policies that must be explained cannot be taken, cannot be explained, in so simple a fashion as partisan politics.

We are told often enough by the President that we have three options. But there are always three options, no matter what the situation may be: do nothing, do a little, do a lot. The issue is not over what the tactics—what the options are—but why it is that the question concerns us at all.

If we had three options in Vietnam in 1965, we also had three options in 1968 and in 1970. It is not enough to say that 17 months ago one thing was done, and now we are doing another. What must be said is why.

That is not so simple, but that is what must be explained. I think that our people understand the options of life well enough, but that they—all of us—are simply puzzled about the larger issue—what, after all, is our goal? Not how do we get there, but where is it?

The fact is that Congress has never answered the question of what our goal is, and has never itself made a commitment to the war in Southeast Asia, beyond a resolution that the Senate now rebuffs, with blessings from the White House itself.

And that has led to the fundamental cause of our national malaise: the use of conscripts in a protracted, and according to the President, indecisive, war.

The draft demands that a man go and fight wherever required, war or no. But this is not what can be demanded of a

man who calls himself free. A free man is not one who can be conscripted to go into combat where his elected representatives have not declared war to exist, as is required in the Constitution.

Congress once placed rigid restraints on the use of draftees. Right up until the very beginning of World War II, no conscript could be sent out of the Western Hemisphere unless Congress authorized it. But the present draft permits the President to use any number of conscripts in any place, regardless of whether Congress has declared war to exist or not.

And so we now force men into combat without so much as bothering to say answer those hard questions: what are our goals, and what are our national objectives?

It is little wonder that thousands resist the draft.

I have for several years sponsored a bill that would prohibit the use of draftees in a combat zone without a declaration of war.

Some of my friends think this to be a radical bill, and others think of it as less than serious. But in fact it is only an extension of a protection that Congress itself demanded 30 years ago.

What Congress has lost is the power to commit our country to war.

Until and unless Congress regains that power, Presidential wars will take place, and the country will again and again be plunged into crises such as we see today.

Congress does not have any authority to determine the conduct of a war, but it does have the authority and the responsibility to determine whether war is justified, and whether a commitment of this Nation to war is necessary, and to what end.

I do not ask that Congress be given the power to control the movement of forces in the field; that is for generals. But what I do ask is that we regain the power to determine whether free men are to be committed to war.

This is not radical; this is not interference with the President; it is simply the recognition of plain constitutional duty, and the exercise of freedom as it was intended to be exercised.

For if Congress forbade the use of conscripts in undeclared wars, we could be assured that protected wars would be avoided, at least until and unless the Congress determined that such wars are necessary, and this would require that we answer those questions that we have so long avoided in Southeast Asia: What are our goals, what are our interests?

Some historians have said in assessing the Korean war that the tragedy was that the American people would permit the use of draftees in a protected and indecisive Asian conflict. These observers believed that the only solution—since there would be future wars in Asia—as indeed Vietnam proved there would be—what had to be done was to provide for a professional army that would be like the Roman legions of old, fighting anywhere to protect the Empire.

But this begged the question. The fact is that in Southeast Asia, France used only professional soldiers and let an ally—the United States—pay a good part

of the bill. But those legions—with a long and proud history—could not win in Indochina. The reason was not military but political. The people of France had no clear idea of why they were being taxed to fight a long and bloody war in Indochina.

And so France was defeated.

The equation has not changed in all the intervening years. The military facts are the same. The U.S. forces in Vietnam cannot be defeated militarily. But this is a political war, and it is begging the question to say that we cannot be defeated militarily—we know that—and it is begging the question to say that all draftees will be out of combat by September. It is useless to talk of weapons seized, rice burned, and men killed, as long as the political questions remain unanswered, and those answers can be neither simple nor painless.

Cambodia is over, but it remains an open question, for the United States has assumed yet another commitment.

The future remains a puzzle, and it will until we know clearly what it is we are trying to achieve in Southeast Asia, and why.

This is what Congress must address itself to. This is what the President must address himself to. It is a matter demanding leadership. It is a matter demanding honesty and courage, not shallow political maneuverings, not debating around moot points. The fact is, painful as it may be, that the answers to the Vietnam riddle will be difficult, and that our painful sacrifice will not easily be ended. I do not think that Americans will shrink from the truth; all they ask is that it be stated. If we do not have the courage to face the questions, then we have no right to be dismayed over division and confusion in the country today.

Let us get on with our task.

INTEGRATION MAY HARM BLACKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, vast sums of taxpayers' money have been and continue to be expended to attain theoretical egalitarian goals through forced integration. Since forced integration is unnatural and the antithesis of liberty, it has created great hostility among all the people and has in reality accomplished nothing. Race relations today are far worse than before 1954 and there has been no evidence of any improvement as the result of appropriations of larger sums of money or passage of additional social force laws.

There is no evidence whatever, that compulsory integration in education has accomplished more academic progress than free choice would have achieved. In fact, the opposite has been proven.

Hearings have been conducted before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Education and Labor Committee concerning integration in education. Two of our country's leading scientific authorities on genetics and behavior have appeared and testified. I feel that the testimony of each of these men is so crucial to full understanding of the edu-

H 6320

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 1, 1970

national problems we face, that include the statements of Dr. Ernest Van Den Haag and Dr. Arthur R. Jensen following my remarks for the information of the Members.

STATEMENT OF DR. ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Ernest van den Haag. I am a Professor of Social Philosophy at New York University, a lecturer at the New School for Social Research in psychology and sociology, and a psychoanalyst in private practice. I received an M.A. degree from University of Iowa, and a Ph. D. degree from New York University. I also have studied in Europe, at the Sorbonne (the University of Paris), the University of Florence, and the University of Naples. I have lectured at Harvard and Yale Universities. I am a member of the Society of Applied Psychoanalysis, Fellow American Sociological Association, Royal Economic Society and New York Academy of Sciences; I am a Guggenheim Fellow (1967).

I am the author of *Education as an Industry* and the coauthor of *The Fabric of Society*. I have published nearly 70 scientific articles in my fields, appearing in professional journals and encyclopedias as well as chapters in books, e.g., "Psychoanalysis and Discontents," appearing in *Psychoanalysis, Scientific Method and Philosophy*, and "Genuine and Spurious Integration," appearing in *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*. I have delivered the Freud Memorial Lecture to the Philadelphia Psycho-analytic Association ("Psychoanalysis and Utopia").

My work mostly concerns study of the relationship of groups. Research in the field of social dynamics analyzes the causes of the formation of groups (including classroom groups or student groups) and how group members relate to others. Such studies are directly applicable to predict the educational result of compulsory congregation in schools.

On the basis of those studies, I appear today to question the validity of the purpose which the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970, H.R. 17846, is intended to serve. Essentially the bill seeks to end what is called racial isolation—defined as more than 50% minority attendance in a single classroom. It is the purpose of the bill as expressed in Section 2 to improve the quality of education in the United States by increasing the degree of compulsory classroom integration between the races. But it is simply assumed, without actual evidence, that integration will be educationally and psychologically beneficial.

This legislation before the Committee assumes fundamentally that academically and socially effective classroom groups can be formed by putting black and white students together in larger numbers in a single classroom regardless of their wishes and that this will improve their education and decrease the differences as well as hostilities which now exist between them. Yet such an enforced congregation of two identifiable racial groups, one deprived in relation to the other, does not diminish, but rather increases the divisive forces which now exist between these students and the consequent increase in classroom tension leads to a substantial decrease in the educational accomplishment of both groups and multiplies the disciplinary problems which detract from the essential student attention required for effective study.

If such integration is compelled, as this bill proposes to do, it will injure rather than assist the future educational accomplishment of the nation's schools.

The blacks who will feel humiliated by their low performance relative to white children—be it owed to genetic, economic,

subcultural or family conditions—are likely to react with redoubled hostility to white pupils, teachers and institutions—to schooling as a whole. It will be labeled "irrelevant."

II. GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND INDIVIDUAL

IDENTITY

(1) Every individual needs to identify with a particular group. Such an identification is essential for the development of personality. This is clearly expressed by Dr. Glauco A. Elmer (Michigan State College) in "Identification as a Social Concept" (*Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (1954), pp. 103-109).

"The social psychologists, however, should start first by relating the individual to his reference and membership groups and then proceed to the finer details of personality problems." . . . In the binding in-group formation, the real identification of individual members are anchored in the group. A sense of solidarity is generated in them as a natural process which manifests itself in actual behavior. In other words, as a group is formed, or as individuals become members of the group, the social process of integration is taking place. Besides the individual members of the group, the integration binds the social values and goals, the psychic characteristics, and the in-group symbols with which the individual members become identified. The social identification which evolves thus constitutes the basis of the group solidarity from which results observable, measurable behavior.

"There must be a personal consciousness of 'belonging' or 'being a part' which is reflected in the opinions and behavior of the persons concerned. Group membership identification implies not an individual's reaction toward a group, but his reaction as a functioning element of the group."

(2) Men react selectively to their fellow men. This preferential association is based upon observable differences, among them overt physical differences and similarities, which form the focal point for group orientation and group identification. Professor George A. Lundberg (University of Washington; past president of the American Sociological Association) writes in "Some Neglected Aspects of the 'Minorities' Problem" (*Modern Age*, Summer, 1958, pp. 285-297):

"In every society men react selectively to their fellow men, in the sense of seeking the association of some and avoiding the association of others. Selective association is necessarily based on some observable differences between those whose association we seek and those whose association we avoid. The differences which are the basis of selective association are of an indefinitely large variety, of all degrees of visibility and subtlety, and vastly different in social consequences: Sex, age, marital condition, religion, socioeconomic status, color, size, shape, health, morals, birth, breeding, and B.O.—the list of differences is endless and varied, but all the items have this in common: (1) they are observable; and (2) they are significant differences to those who react selectively to people with the characteristics in question. It is, therefore, wholly absurd to try to ignore, deny or talk out of existence these differences just because we do not approve of some of their social results . . ."

Professor Lundberg with an associate also studied high school students in Seattle, Washington, to find out the determinants of their preferential associations in leadership, work, dating, and friendship. Lundberg reported in "Selective Association Among Ethnic Groups in a High School Population" (*American Sociological Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1952)). He found:

" . . . every ethnic group showed a preference for its own members in each of the four relationships covered by the question. . . . ethnocentrism or prejudice is not con-

fined to the majority of the dominant group . . .

" . . . A certain amount of ethnocentrism is a normal and necessary ingredient of all group life, i.e., it is the basic characteristic that differentiates one group from another and thus is fundamental to social structure. Ethnocentrism ('discrimination,' 'prejudice') is, therefore, not in itself necessarily to be regarded as a problem. It is rather a question of determining what degree of it (a) is functional for social survival and satisfaction under given conditions, or at least (b) is not regarded by a society as a problem in the sense of requiring community action. The amount of discrimination that has been shown to exist in the present study, for example, is not incompatible with the peaceful and efficient functioning of the institution in question . . ."

There are a substantial number of studies reported in social science literature which indicate that the attitudes reported in Lundberg's study of Seattle, Washington, are not confined to that particular city. Indeed, social scientists find in all areas where groups of diverse origin and appearance come into contact, some degree of race preference and selective association is manifested by the various groups.

(3) At one time it was assumed that certain areas of the world were free from race prejudice. Hawaii and Brazil were often cited as examples of interracial "alohas" where all race prejudice had disappeared. More careful students of these areas have found that despite a superficial interracial harmony, racial preferences and prejudices are manifested in both these areas. In "Racial Attitudes in Brazil" (*American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, No. 5 (1949), pp. 402-408), Dr. Emilio Willems described color prejudice in the city of Sao Paulo, Brazil, as manifested in a series of interviews carried out among middle and upper-class whites. Dr. Willems found:

"Of the 245 advertisers, 194 were interviewed about the reasons for their unfavorable attitude toward Negro servants. In this interview, 48 were unable to give any clear answer, but they found their own attitude 'very natural.' 18 advertisers did not accept Negro servants because of presumed lack of cleanliness; 30 thought black housemaids were always thieves; 14 alleged instability and lack of assiduity; and 12 said only that they were used to white servants and therefore did not wish to engage colored ones. Seven persons precluded Negroes because of the contact they would have with their young children. There were a few other reasons, such as 'race odor,' 'bad character,' 'laziness,' 'carelessness,' and other imperfections that were ascribed to Negro servants."

"There are many situations in social life where white people refuse to be seen with Negroes. In such public places as high-class hotels, restaurants, or casinos, fashionable clubs and dances, Negroes are not desired, and there are few whites who dare to introduce Negro friends or relatives into such places. This discrimination was strongly represented by middle-class Negroes. On the other hand, those Negroes complained bitterly of the contemptuous attitudes that middle-class mulattoes assumed toward them."

"Yet our inquiry led to some other interesting results. In 23 out of 36 cases the questionnaires contained references to formal associations of all kinds from which Negroes were excluded. Usually these associations are clubs maintained by the upper-class families of the city. Though there does not exist any reference to Negro members in club statutes, these are rarely admitted . . ."

In "Stereotypes, Norms and Interracial Behavior in Sao Paulo, Brazil" (*American Sociological Review*, Vol. 22, No. 6 (1957)). Professors Roger Bastide and Pierre van den Berghe found on the basis of a questionnaire given to 580 white students from five